

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO**

**League of Women Voters of Ohio, *et al.*,** :  
 :  
 **Petitioners,** : **Case No. 2021-1193**  
 :  
 : **Original Action Filed Pursuant to**  
 v. : **Ohio Constitution, Article XI, Section 9(A)**  
 :  
 :  
 **Ohio Redistricting Commission, *et al.*,** : **[Apportionment Case Pursuant to S. Ct.**  
 : **Prac. R. 14.03]**  
 **Respondents.** :

---

**Bria Bennett, *et al.*,** :  
 :  
 **Petitioners,** : **Case No. 2021-1198**  
 :  
 : **Original Action Filed Pursuant to**  
 v. : **Ohio Constitution, Article XI, Section 9(A)**  
 :  
 :  
 **Ohio Redistricting Commission, *et al.*,** : **[Apportionment Case Pursuant to S. Ct.**  
 : **Prac. R. 14.03]**  
 **Respondents.** :

---

**The Ohio Organizing Collaborative, *et al.*,** :  
 :  
 **Petitioners,** : **Case No. 2021-1210**  
 :  
 : **Original Action Filed Pursuant to**  
 v. : **Ohio Constitution, Article XI, Section 9(A)**  
 :  
 :  
 **Ohio Redistricting Commission, *et al.*,** : **[Apportionment Case Pursuant to S. Ct.**  
 : **Prac. R. 14.03]**  
 **Respondents.** :

---

**RESPONSE OF RESPONDENTS SENATOR VERNON SYKES AND HOUSE  
MINORITY LEADER C. ALLISON RUSSO TO PETITIONERS' OBJECTIONS**

---

C. BENJAMIN COOPER (0093103)

*Counsel of Record*

CHARLES H. COOPER, JR. (0037295)

CHELSEA C. WEAVER (0096850)

Cooper & Elliott, LLC

305 West Nationwide Boulevard

Columbus, Ohio 43215

(614) 481-6000

(614) 481-6001 (fax)

benc@cooperelliott.com

chipc@cooperelliott.com

chelseaw@cooperelliott.com

**Special Counsel for Respondents**

**Senator Vernon Sykes and**

**House Minority Leader C. Allison Russo**

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCKET.COM

FREDA J. LEVENSON (0045916)  
ACLU of Ohio Foundation, Inc.  
4506 Chester Avenue  
Cleveland, OH 44103  
Tel: (614) 586-1972 x125  
flevenson@acluohio.org

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

ALORA THOMAS (PHV 22010)  
JULIE A. EBENSTEIN (PHV 25423)  
American Civil Liberties Union  
125 Broad Street  
New York, NY 10004  
Tel: (212) 519-7866  
athomas@aclu.org  
jebenstein@aclu.org

ROBERT D. FRAM (PHV 25414)  
DONALD BROWN (PHV 25480)  
JOSHUA GONZÁLEZ (PHV 25424)  
DAVID DENUYL (PHV 25452)  
JULIANA GOLDROSEN (PHV 25193)  
Covington & Burling LLP  
Salesforce Tower  
415 Mission Street, Suite 5400  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Tel: (415) 591-6000  
rfram@cov.com

ALEXANDER THOMAS (PHV 25462)  
Covington & Burling LLP  
850 W. Tenth Street, NW  
Washington DC 20001  
Tel: (202) 662-5968  
athomson@cov.com

ANUPAM SHARMA (PHV 25418)  
YALE FU (PHV 25419)  
Covington & Burling LLP  
3000 El Camino Real  
5 Palo Alto Square, 10th Floor  
Palo Alto, CA 94306  
Tel: (650) 632-4716  
asharma@cov.com  
yfu@cov.com

**Counsel for Petitioners**  
**League of Women Voters of Ohio, *et al.***

DONALD J. MCTIGUE (0022849)  
DEREK S. CLINGER (0092075)  
McTigue Colombo & Clinger LLC  
545 East Town Street  
Columbus, OH 43215  
Tel: (614) 263-7000  
dmctigue@electionlawgroup.com  
dclinger@electionlawgroup.com

ABHA KHANNA (PHV 2189)  
BEN STAFFORD (PHV 25433)  
Elias Law Group  
1700 Seventh Ave., Suite 2100  
Seattle, WA 98101  
Tel: (206) 656-0716  
akhanna@elias.law  
bstafford@elias.law

JYOTI JASRASARIA (PHV 25401)  
SPENCER W. KLEIN (PHV 25432)  
Elias Law Group  
10 G Street NE, Suite 600  
Washington, DC 20002  
Tel: (202) 968-4490  
jjasrasaria@elias.law  
sklein@elias.law

**Counsel for Petitioners**  
**Bria Bennett, *et al.***

ALICIA L. BANNON (PHV 25409)  
YURIJ RUDENSKY (PHV 25422)  
HARRY BLACK (PHV 25544)  
Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School  
of Law  
120 Broadway, Suite 1750  
New York, NY 10271  
Tel: (646) 292-8310  
alicia.bannon@nyu.edu

PETER M. ELLIS (0070264)  
M. PATRICK YINGLING (PHV 10145)  
NATALIE R. SALAZAR  
Reed Smith LLP  
10 South Wacker Drive, 40th Floor  
Chicago, IL 60606  
Tel: (312) 207-1000  
pellis@reedsmith.com

BRIAN A. SUTHERLAND (PHV 25406)  
Reed Smith LLP  
101 Second Street, Suite 1800  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Tel: (415) 543-8700  
bsutherland@reedsmith.com

BEN R. FLIEGEL (PHV 25411)  
Reed Smith LLP  
355 South Grand Avenue, Suite 2900  
Los Angeles, CA 90071  
Tel: (213) 457-8000  
bfliegel@reedsmith.com

BRAD A. FUNARI (PHV 3139)  
DANIELLE L. STEWART (0084086)  
Reed Smith LLP  
225 Fifth Avenue  
Pittsburgh, PA 15222  
Tel: (412) 288-4583  
bfunari@reedsmith.com  
dstewart@reedsmith.com

**Counsel for Petitioners**  
**The Ohio Organizing Collaborative, *et al.***

JOHN W. ZEIGER (0010707)  
MARION H. LITTLE, JR. (0042679)  
CHRISTOPHER J. HOGAN (0079829)  
Zeiger, Tigges & Little LLP  
3500 Huntington Center  
41 South High Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
Tel: (614) 365-9900  
zeiger@litoio.com  
little@litoio.com  
hogan@litoio.com

**Counsel for Respondent  
Governor Mike DeWine**

JONATHAN D. BLANTON (0070035)  
JULIE M. PFEIFFER (0069762)  
MICHAEL A. WALTON (0092201)  
Ohio Attorney General  
30 E. Broad Street, 16th Floor  
Columbus, OH 43215  
Tel: (614) 466-2872  
jonathan.blanton@ohioago.gov  
julie.pfeiffer@ohioago.gov  
michael.walton@ohioago.gov

**Counsel for Respondents  
Secretary of State Frank LaRose and  
Auditor Keith Faber**

ERIK J. CLARK (0078732)  
ASHLEY MERINO (0096853)  
Organ Law LLP  
1330 Dublin Road  
Columbus, OH 43215  
Tel: (614) 481-0900  
ejclark@organlegal.com  
amerino@organlegal.com

**Counsel for Respondent  
Ohio Redistricting Commission**

W. STUART DORNETTE (0002955)  
BETH A. BRYAN (0082076)  
PHILIP D. WILLIAMSON (0097174)  
Taft Stettinius & Hollister LLP  
425 Walnut St., Suite 1800  
Cincinnati, OH 45202  
Tel: (513) 381-2838  
dornette@taftlaw.com  
bryan@taftlaw.com  
pwilliamson@taftlaw.com

PHILLIP J. STRACH (PHV 25444)  
THOMAS A. FARR (PHV 25461)  
JOHN E. BRANCH, III (PHV 25460)  
ALYSSA M. RIGGINS (PHV 25441)  
GREG MCGUIRE (PHV 25483)  
Nelson Mullins Riley & Scarborough LLP  
4140 Parklake Ave., Suite 200  
Raleigh, NC 27612  
Tel: (919) 329-3812  
phil.strach@nelsonmullins.com  
tom.farr@nelsonmullins.com  
john.branch@nelsonmullins.com  
alyssa.riggins@nelsonmullins.com  
greg.mcguire@nelsonmullins.com

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

**RESPONSE OF RESPONDENTS SENATOR VERNON SYKES AND  
HOUSE MINORITY LEADER C. ALLISON RUSSO  
TO PETITIONERS' OBJECTIONS FILED APRIL 1, 2022**

The Republican Commissioners have forced this Court to declare once again—for a fourth time—that the Commission’s General Assembly-district plan is unconstitutional. In both substance and process, the Fourth Plan brazenly violates Ohio’s Constitution and the Court’s repeated instructions. *See League of Women Voters of Ohio v. Ohio Redistricting Comm.*, Slip Opinion No. 2022-Ohio-65 (“*LWV I*”); *League of Women Voters of Ohio v. Ohio Redistricting Comm.*, Slip Opinion No. 2022-Ohio-342 (“*LWV II*”); *League of Women Voters of Ohio v. Ohio Redistricting Comm.*, Slip Opinion No. 2022-Ohio-789 (“*LWV III*”).

It did not have to be this way. The Commission had before it a constitutional plan. The plan was drafted, in public, by independent experts hired by the Commission itself; the Commission met almost daily to monitor progress and provide feedback on the plan; the plan complied with Article XI, Sections 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7, subject to final checks for technical flaws; and the plan contained a proportionate distribution of toss-up districts, corresponded closely to the statewide preferences of Ohio’s voters, and was more compact than the plan adopted by the Commission. *Glassburn Aff.* (Apr. 3, 2022) ¶¶ 9, 11–15, 26–27; *Russo Aff.* (Apr. 3, 2022) ¶ 7; *LWV III*, ¶¶ 30, 32–34, 38–42, 44. But the Republican Commissioners rejected the independent mapmakers’ plan.

It now appears this Court has only one more opportunity to motivate the Commission to adopt a constitutional map for the 2022 primary election. A federal court has indicated that, absent state action, it will choose the 2022 General Assembly map by April 20. Senator Sykes and Leader Russo respectfully believe the Court should seize this final opportunity and order the relief discussed below.

## **I. THE FOURTH PLAN VIOLATES SECTIONS 6(A) AND 6(B).**

Senator Sykes and Leader Russo agree with the Petitioners: the Fourth Plan violates Sections 6(A) and 6(B) of Article XI of the Ohio Constitution. *See* Bennett Petitioners’ Objs. to Mar. 28 Plan at 15–28; Ohio Organizing Collaborative Petitioners’ Objs. to Mar. 28 Plan at 9–14; League of Women Voters of Ohio Petitioners’ Objs. to Mar. 28 Plan at 15–23. It is hard to see how it could not. The Fourth Plan is all but identical to the unconstitutional Third Plan, *Glassburn Aff.* (Apr. 3, 2022) ¶ 25, and it must be struck down for the same reasons.

The process that produced the Fourth Plan is particularly insulting to this Court, the Minority Commissioners, and the voters of Ohio. This Court ordered “*the commission*” to draft and adopt an “entirely new” plan “in public” with “frequent meetings” and “bipartisan efforts.” *LWV III*, ¶ 44. The Court and Ohioans instead received a plan drafted by a Republican staffer, in secret, using the unconstitutional Third Plan as its starting point. *Russo Aff.* (Apr. 3, 2022) ¶ 59–60. Most Commissioners—including Republican Commissioners—had not even seen the Fourth Plan before it was swiftly proposed and adopted. *Sykes Aff.* (Apr. 3, 2022) ¶ 68. The Republican Commissioners did not allow any time for review or consideration of amendments. *Id.* The Fourth Plan was, for the fourth time, the product of a single party’s exclusive control of the redistricting process. *LWV I*, ¶ 120.

The Republican Commissioners claimed they had to adopt the Fourth Plan to meet the Court’s March 28 deadline. *See* Ohio Redistricting Comm. Section 8(C)(2) Statement at 2 (Mar. 28, 2022).<sup>1</sup> But the Independent Mapmakers’ Plan was finished and even voted on by the March 28 deadline. *Sykes Aff.* (Apr. 3, 2022) ¶ 69, 71. The Republican Commissioners then claimed

---

<sup>1</sup> Available at <https://www.redistricting.ohio.gov/assets/organizations/redistricting-commission/events/commission-meeting-march-28-2022-281/section-8c2-statement-1502.pdf>.



they could not adopt the Independent Mapmakers' Plan on March 28 because they needed more time to assess the plan and had concerns about its compactness. *Id.*; Russo Aff. (Apr. 3, 2022) ¶ 63. But the Republican Commissioners had been monitoring the independent mapmakers every day and had ample opportunity to provide feedback. And they had just voted to adopt a plan first seen by most *just minutes before the vote*, and that plan was *less compact* than the Independent Mapmakers' Plan. Sykes Aff. (Apr. 3, 2022) ¶ 68, 71.

The Republican Commissioners' stated reasons for their actions do not add up. Given the Independent Mapmakers' Plan, there was no need to adopt an unconstitutional plan developed through a procedure the Commissioners know this Court will reject. The brazen disregard for this Court's orders begs the question: why would the Majority Commissioners force through a plan they know is unconstitutional, when a constitutional option existed?

The Republican Commissioners may believe that if they continue to disregard this Court's orders in favor of maps that entrench their supermajority, the federal court will be forced to adopt one of their unconstitutional maps. Perhaps they plan to adopt a fifth unconstitutional plan that this Court will not have time to invalidate—an end-run around this Court and, more importantly, the Ohio Constitution.

**II. A FEDERAL COURT WILL ALMOST CERTAINLY IMPOSE A MAP BY APRIL 20, SO STRONG AND SWIFT REMEDIES FROM THIS COURT ARE STILL NEEDED.**

This Court is aware of *Gonidakis et al. v. LaRose*, S.D. Ohio No. 2:22-cv-773, the federal court case involving an apportionment challenge to the General Assembly districts at issue in this case. Because of this case, this Court needs to adopt swift, strong remedies to vindicate the Ohio Constitution.

On Wednesday, March 30, the three-judge federal court held a preliminary injunction hearing. Minute Entry, *id.*, ECF No. 143 (Mar. 30, 2022). During the hearing, the court indicated that it will protect Ohioans' federal voting rights by ensuring a General Assembly primary election occurs, but it will wait to act as late as it can. After extensive questioning by the court, Secretary LaRose's Director of Elections testified that the General Assembly primary election could be held as late as August 2, so long as a final map is in place by April 20.<sup>2</sup>

What map will the federal court impose, if necessary, on April 20? The court's questions at the hearing indicated it is considering the Third Plan, the Fourth Plan, the maps implemented in 2011, and potentially other maps presented at the hearing, including the Independent Mapmakers' Plan.<sup>3</sup> The court would also likely consider any new plans adopted by the Commission.

How will the federal court choose among the maps? The court's questions indicated that it hopes to do the "least violence" to Ohio law. Some panel members suggested that a map that has not *yet* been declared unconstitutional is better than one that has. At least one panel member remarked that a map not adopted by the Commission (such as the Independent Mapmakers' Plan) is unconstitutional, even if it otherwise meets the substantive constitutional criteria. The court ordered expedited post-hearing briefing that encompasses these questions.

A concern emerges against this backdrop. Suppose the Court invalidates the Fourth Plan and reconvenes the Commission. If the Commission adopts a "Fifth Plan" before April 20, but

---

<sup>2</sup> The descriptions are based on the recollection of counsel present at the hearing. The transcript of the hearing was completed on Sunday, April 3, around 3:00 p.m. Senator Sykes and Leader Russo were not able to obtain a copy in time to incorporate it into this filing.

<sup>3</sup> Indeed, the court asked all parties to specifically address in their post-hearing briefs why the court should *not* impose the 2011 maps.

before this Court can review it, the federal court may impose the Fifth Plan because on April 20 it will be the only plan adopted by the Commission that has not yet been declared unconstitutional by this Court. This could occur even if the Fifth Plan brazenly violates Ohio's Constitution, and even if this Court later declares it unconstitutional. After April 20, it will be too late to change the plan for the 2022 election.

To guard against this situation, Senator Sykes and Leader Russo respectfully urge the Court to take strong action in an expedited fashion that would allow this Court to rule on any such Fifth Plan before April 20. Specifically, they ask that the Court:

**1. Issue an Order immediately, with an opinion to follow.** Issuing an order with opinions to follow, which is a common practice in fast-paced elections cases, would allow the Court to reconvene the Commission and provide essential direction as quickly as possible. *See, e.g., Harper v. Hall*, 867 S.E.2d 554 (N.C. Feb. 4, 2022) (order) (“Because time is pressing, the Court enters the following order, to be followed by an opinion . . . .”); *Harper v. Hall*, 2022-NCSC-17 (N.C. Feb. 14, 2022) (opinion); *Carter v. Chapman*, 2022 Pa. LEXIS 194 (Pa. Feb. 23, 2022) (order); *Carter v. Chapman*, 2022 Pa. LEXIS 257 (Pa. Mar. 9, 2022) (opinion).

**2. Invalidate the Fourth Plan in its entirety.** The plan violates Article XI, Sections 6(A) and 6(B), as discussed above.

**3. Order the Commission to reconvene and, within 4 days, adopt a map drafted by the Commission's independent mapmakers, rather than caucus staff.** *See LWV I*, ¶ 136 (“[I]t is appropriate to issue further remedial orders in an effort to have the redistricting commission adopt a plan that complies with Article XI in time for the plan to be effective for the 2022 election cycle.”). This would allow the independent mapmakers to correct technical errors (if any) to the plans they have already produced and otherwise make amendments based on the Commissioners’

suggestions that do not disturb the constitutionality of the plan. The Court should specify that any Fifth Plan must be at least as symmetrical as the Independent Map Drawers' Plan. The Commissioners should be mandated to follow their clear duty to adopt a constitutional map when a constitutional map is before them.

**4. Establish a timeline so that any Fifth Plan adopted by the Commission can be ruled on by this Court before April 20.** Senator Sykes and Leader Russo agree with the schedule set forth in the Bennett Petitioners' objections, at page 32:

Respondents' response on Fourth Plan due	April 4
Court order issued, with opinion to follow	April 7
Commission must adopt constitutional plan drawn by independent map drawer(s)	April 11
Petitioners' objections due	April 13
Respondents' responses due	April 15

**5. Declare the Independent Mapmakers' Plan presumptively constitutional.** To assist the Commission, the Court could declare that the Independent Mapmakers' Plan is presumptively constitutional in light of the undisputed record evidence. *See, e.g.,* Glassburn Aff. (Apr. 3, 2022) ¶ 26; OOC Petitioners' Objs. to Mar. 28 Plan at 21–22. This is particularly important given that the federal court will be choosing a plan by April 20. In the interests of federalism, the federal court should respect this Court's decision as to the constitutionality of maps and seek to impose a map that does not violate the Ohio Constitution. *See Growe v. Emison*, 507 U.S. 25, 35–36, 113 S.Ct. 1075, 122 L.Ed.2d 388 (1993); *White v. Weiser*, 412 U.S. 783, 795, 93 S.Ct. 2348, 37 L.Ed.2d 335 (1973). To aid that process, too, this Court should declare the Independent Mapmakers' Plan presumptively constitutional.

**6. Order any other relief the Court deems just and necessary to ensure that Ohioans can vote under a constitutional plan.** The Court has broad inherent power to “do all things reasonably necessary to the administration of justice in the case before it.” *See City of Norwood v. Horney*, 110 Ohio St.3d 353, 2006-Ohio-3799, 853 N.E.2d 1115, ¶ 119, quoting *Smothers v. Lewis*, 672 S.W.2d 62, 64-65 (Ky. 1984). It also has inherent authority to enforce its judgments and decrees, *Infinite Sec. Sols., L.L.C. v. Karam Properties, II, Ltd.*, 143 Ohio St.3d 346, 2015-Ohio-1101, 37 N.E.3d 1211, ¶ 27, and to facilitate “orderly and efficient exercise of [its] jurisdiction,” *Hale v. State*, 55 Ohio St. 210, 45 N.E. 199 (1896).

### **CONCLUSION**

Senator Sykes and Leader Russo respectfully ask that this Court invalidate the Fourth Plan in its entirety and order the other remedies described above.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ C. Benjamin Cooper

C. Benjamin Cooper (0093103)

*Counsel of Record*

Charles H. Cooper, Jr. (0037295)

Chelsea C. Weaver (0096850)

Cooper & Elliott, LLC

305 West Nationwide Boulevard

Columbus, Ohio 43215

(614) 481-6000

(614) 481-6001 (fax)

benc@cooperelliott.com

chipc@cooperelliott.com

chelseaw@cooperelliott.com

*Special Counsel for Respondents Senator Vernon  
Sykes and House Minority Leader Allison Russo*

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on April 4, 2022, the foregoing *Response of Respondents Senator Vernon Sykes and House Minority Leader C. Allison Russo to Petitioners' Objections* was filed electronically and sent via email to the following counsel of record:

FREDA J. LEVENSON, flevenson@acluohio.org  
DAVID J. CAREY, dcarey@acluohio.org  
ALORA THOMAS, athomas@aclu.org  
JULIE A. EBENSTEIN, jebenstein@aclu.org  
ROBERT D. FRAM, rfram@cov.com  
ALEXANDER THOMAS, athomson@cov.com  
YALE FU, yfu@cov.com  
ANUPAM SHARMA, asharma@cov.com

**Counsel for Petitioners**  
**League of Women Voters of Ohio, et al.**

DONALD J. MCTIGUE, dmctigue@electionlawgroup.com  
DEREK S. CLINGER, dclinger@electionlawgroup.com  
ABHA KHANNA, akhanna@elias.law  
WILLIAM B. STAFFORD, bstafford@elias.law  
ARIA C. BRANCH, abbranch@elias.law  
JYOTI JASRASARIA, jjasrasaria@elias.law  
SPENCER W. KLEIN, sklein@elias.law

**Counsel for Petitioners**  
**Bria Bennett, et al.**

ALICIA L. BANNON, alicia.bannon@nyu.edu  
PETER M. ELLIS, pellis@reedsmith.com  
M. PATRICK YINGLING, mpyingling@reedsmith.com  
BEN R. FLIEGEL, bfliegel@reedsmith.com  
BRAD A. FUNARI, bfunari@reedsmith.com  
DANIELLE L. STEWART, dstewart@reedsmith.com  
BRIAN A. SUTHERLAND, bsutherland@reedsmith.com

**Counsel for Petitioners**  
**The Ohio Organizing Collaborative, et al.**

ERIK J. CLARK, ejclark@organlegal.com  
ASHLEY MERINO, amerino@organlegal.com

**Counsel for Respondent  
Ohio Redistricting Commission**

JOHN W. ZEIGER, zeiger@litohio.com  
MARION H. LITTLE, JR., little@litohio.com  
CHRISTOPHER J. HOGAN, hogan@litohio.com

**Counsel for Respondent  
Governor Mike DeWine**

JONATHAN D. BLANTON, jonathan.blanton@ohioago.gov  
JULIE M. PFEIFFER, julie.pfeiffer@ohioago.gov  
MICHAEL A. WALTON, michael.walton@ohioago.gov

**Counsel for Respondents  
Secretary of State Frank LaRose and Auditor Keith Faber**

W. STUART DORNETTE, dornette@taftlaw.com  
BETH A. BRYAN, bryan@taftlaw.com  
PHILIP D. WILLIAMSON, pwilliamson@taftlaw.com  
PHILLIP J. STRACH, phil.strach@nelsonmullins.com  
THOMAS A. FARR, tom.farr@nelsonmullins.com  
JOHN E. BRANCH, III, john.branch@nelsonmullins.com  
ALYSSA M. RIGGINS, alyssa.riggins@nelsonmullins.com  
GREG MCGUIRE, greg.mcguire@nelsonmullins.com

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

/s/ C. Benjamin Cooper  
C. Benjamin Cooper

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

League of Women Voters of Ohio, *et al.*, :  
 : Case No. 2021-1193  
 Petitioners, :  
 : Original Action Filed Pursuant to  
 v. : Ohio Constitution, Article XI, Section 9(A)  
 :  
 Ohio Redistricting Commission, *et al.*, : [Apportionment Case Pursuant to S. Ct.  
 : Prac. R. 14.03]  
 Respondents. :

---

Bria Bennett, *et al.*, :  
 : Case No. 2021-1198  
 Petitioners, :  
 : Original Action Filed Pursuant to  
 v. : Ohio Constitution, Article XI, Section 9(A)  
 :  
 Ohio Redistricting Commission, *et al.*, : [Apportionment Case Pursuant to S. Ct.  
 : Prac. R. 14.03]  
 Respondents. :

---

The Ohio Organizing Collaborative, *et al.*, :  
 : Case No. 2021-1210  
 Petitioners, :  
 : Original Action Filed Pursuant to  
 v. : Ohio Constitution, Article XI, Section 9(A)  
 :  
 Ohio Redistricting Commission, *et al.*, : [Apportionment Case Pursuant to S. Ct.  
 : Prac. R. 14.03]  
 Respondents. :

---

AFFIDAVIT OF RESPONDENT VERNON SYKES

---



State of Ohio  
County of Franklin, SS:

I, Vernon Sykes, hereby submit the following affidavit and state under oath and penalty of perjury as follows:

1. I am the State Senator for Ohio's 28th Senate District.

2. I serve as a commissioner on, and co-chair of, the Ohio Redistricting Commission ("Commission"). I am the only Black person and person of color on the Commission. I serve as a representative of the Democratic Party, along with House Minority Leader Allison Russo (together, the "Democratic Commissioners"). The remaining five Commissioners are Republicans (together, the "Republican Commissioners"). I was sued in the above-captioned case and am a named Respondent. The Ohio Supreme Court, however, has recognized that my interests align more with the Petitioners than that of the Commission or the Republican Commissioners. Opinion 2022-Ohio-65, ¶ 66.

3. I submit this affidavit in response to the Court's March 16, 2022 order to respond to the Petitioners' renewed motions for an order directing Respondents to show cause as to why the Commission and Respondents should not be held in contempt.

4. In addition to this affidavit, I have filed three other affidavits in these proceedings, each of which detail my efforts throughout the redistricting process to comply with the Ohio Constitution and all the orders of this Court, which are incorporated by reference. *See* March 3, 2022 Affidavit of Vernon Sykes in support of Respondents' Response to Petitioners' Objections; February 23, 2022 Affidavit of Vernon Sykes in support of Respondents' Response to Court's February 18 Show Cause Order; Jan. 28, 2022 Affidavit of Vernon Sykes in support of Respondents' Response to Petitioner's Objections.

## Introduction

5. It is with great disappointment that I file this affidavit with the Court. Yet again, because of the actions of my Republican colleagues, I find myself asking this Court not to hold me in contempt.

6. At every step I have worked diligently to comply with the Constitution and this Court's orders. Among other things, described in greater detail below, I took the following actions: (1) pushed the Commission to meet early and often; (2) encouraged the Commission to utilize independent mapmakers and mediators; (3) pressed for a transparent process; (4) voted for the independent maps because they satisfy all the constitutional requirements; and (5) resisted—albeit unsuccessfully—the hijacking of the process by Republican Commissioners, all of which disparaged the independent mapmakers' efforts and four of whom adopted an unconstitutional map over my dissent.

7. In many ways, the Commission's process following this Court's March 16, 2022 order was a model of cooperation and transparency—one that should have transpired from the outset, but, even if belated, was still an encapsulation of the fair mapping process the Ohio voters mandated in Article XI of the Ohio Constitution. The Court made several strong suggestions in its March 16 order: hire an independent mapdrawer to draw the maps, draw the maps in public, and do not let the partisan mapdrawers control the mouse. Opinion, 2022-Ohio-789 ¶¶ 30, 44 (“*LWV III*”).

8. And the Commission listened. The Commission hired independent mapdrawers to work on behalf of *the Commission*, not any party. The Commission (at least at first) ordered those mapdrawers to follow only Article XI and this Court's orders. And those independent mapdrawers

worked in public—their every discussion with staff or Commissioners, click of the mouse, and late-night work sessions viewable via livestream on the Ohio Channel.

9. Through these collaborative efforts, the independent mapdrawers drew General Assembly maps that satisfied the Constitution, as delineated in this Court’s orders.

10. As detailed below, I both led and supported all of these efforts to have independent maps, even in the face of the Republican Commissioners’ stall tactics and pessimism regarding the independent mapdrawers’ ability to complete the task. And I voted for the independent mapdrawers’ plans.

11. But the Republican Commissioners were more concerned with protecting their supermajority than following the Constitution, this Court’s orders, and their duty to the public. Rather than adopting the independent mapdrawers’ plans, four of the Republican Commissioners unilaterally adopted new General Assembly maps on March 28, 2022 (the “Fourth Plan”) that is nearly identical to the last one (the “Third Plan”) that this Court found unconstitutional on March 16, 2022. *LWV III* ¶ 44. I did not vote to adopt those maps because I believe they violate Article XI of the Ohio Constitution, as well as the Ohio Supreme Court’s orders.

12. It is with sadness that I report that this Court’s suggestion—to hire independent mapmakers who draw the maps in public—and clear orders regarding proportionality and symmetry, were not enough for my Republican colleagues. But I am also hopeful that, with an aggressive order from this Court, we can return to the independent mapdrawers’ plans, finalize them quickly (to the extent any finalizing is even necessary), and have a constitutional plan for Ohio’s voters. We have made so much progress, and I still hope that—with this Court’s further guidance—we can deliver constitutional maps to the people of Ohio.

**The Democratic Commissioners Worked Diligently to Schedule Frequent Meetings and Hire Independent Mapdrawers and Mediators Upon Receiving the March 16 Order.**

13. **Wednesday, March 16, 2022.** As urged by the Democratic Commissioners, the Ohio Supreme Court invalidated the Third Plan in an opinion and order published at approximately 9:45pm on March 16, 2022.

14. That order, as I understand it, set forth important mandates and guidance to the Commission that I diligently worked to follow throughout the process.

15. *First*, it invalidated the Third Plan in part because of the “gross and unnecessary disparity in the allocation of close districts,” as the Third Plan had 19 so-called Democratic-leaning House districts and 7 so-called Democratic-leaning Senate districts that were in the 50 – 52% margin, and no such Republican-leaning House or Senate districts. *LWV III* ¶ 43. That meant, going forward, the Commission needed to draw a plan that met the 45-54 proportionality ratio, as close as possible while complying with Article XI, §§ 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7—but in doing so, competitive seats of between 50 and 52% needed to be symmetrically allocated and not be so one-sided against either party.

16. *Second*, the Court ordered the Commission “to be reconstituted and to convene and that the commission draft and adopt an entirely new General Assembly-district plan that conforms with the Ohio Constitution, including Article XI, Sections 6(A) and 6(B).” *LWV III* ¶ 44. Based on the Court’s reasoning, I understood this to be a command that the Commission as a body, rather than partisan staff, draft the General Assembly plan.

17. *Third*, the Court told the Commission that we “should retain an independent mapdrawer—who answers to all commission members, not only to the Republican legislative leaders—to draft a plan.” *LWV III* ¶ 30. I thought this was an excellent way to move forward and

could take the partisan influence out of the process—an independent person (or persons) could “draft a plan.”

18. *Fourth*, the Court mandated a “transparent process,” including that “drafting should occur in public” and that “the commissioners should convene frequent meetings.” *LWV III* ¶ 44.

19. The Court gave the Commission a deadline of March 28 to file a new plan with the Secretary of State and until March 29 at 9:00am to file the plan with the Court. *LWV III* ¶ 45.

20. **Thursday, March 17, 2022.** First thing in the morning, I spoke with the Senate Minority’s legal counsel to discuss the opinion and asked them to work with me in getting the Commission to comply with the Court’s order. Then I attempted to reach Co-Chair Speaker Cupp to discuss reconvening the commission, setting frequent meetings, hiring independent mapdrawers, and otherwise work to comply with the Court’s March 16 order. When I finally reached Co-Chair Cupp in the afternoon, he was noncommittal as to taking any steps, including the basic step of when he would agree to call a first meeting of the Commission.

21. Later that afternoon I sent a formal letter to Co-Chair Cupp and the rest of the Commission reiterating the points I had made in our phone conversation; namely, that we should have frequent meetings, that the public should be notified in advance of those meetings, and that the process should be transparent. I specifically suggested that we retain independent mapdrawers and mediators. That March 17 letter is attached as Exhibit A.

22. **Friday, March 18, 2022.** In the late morning, I spoke with Co-Chair Cupp, and he agreed to schedule a Commission meeting for Saturday at 2:00pm.

23. That day, we also received a letter from Attorney General Yost discussing his suggestions for “steps forward” given the March 16 Order. Specifically, Yost encouraged daily meetings and drafting maps in public. He also stated that “[t]he Court directed the commission to

hire new mapmakers not beholden to either political caucus,” and, to that end, explained that he had retained Sean Trende, a Republican analyst, and Bernie Grofman, a Democratic professor of political science, to help in the mapdrawing process. Attorney General Yost’s letter is attached as Exhibit B.

24. The Attorney General, as “chief legal officer of the state” also articulated what was and was not permissible in drawing a new map. He explained to us that the Court “established <52% as the threshold for a ‘leaning’ district; any index less than that is viewed by the Court as a competitive district,” and are “excluded[d]” from the proportionality calculation. And he told us that “efforts to protect incumbents are improper” and, citing the Court’s opinions, ““can neither be a legitimate and neutral goal nor comport with Article XI, Section 6(A).”” *Id.*

25. **Saturday, March 19, 2022.** The Commission met for the first time after the order on March 19, 2022. At that meeting, the Commissioners discussed several possibilities of moving forward; some appeared to want to move forward solely with the partisan staff drawing. I pushed for hiring independent mapdrawers, in accordance with the Court’s suggestion. However, I was concerned that the Commission would not agree on a single mapdrawer and agreed that we could hire two independent mapdrawers, one selected by each caucus of the Commission. Though each mapdrawer would be selected by a caucus, they would both be independent and work for the Commission as a whole. I also suggested hiring a mediator in case disagreements arose.

26. President Huffman noted that one advantage of having independent mapdrawers is that they are not “beholden to anyone in particular” and do not know where any incumbents live. Acknowledging that the Court had singled him out for his previous prioritizing of incumbency, President Huffman stated: “I think [prioritizing incumbency] was also criticized by the court [and]

that we should not consider incumbency in drawing these maps. So, I just want to kind of get that out.” Tr. 3/19/2022 at 46:22.

27. Co-Chair Cupp expressed that he was “skeptical” regarding mediation, pointed out a number of “practical concerns” regarding the process, and hoped that Commission “members aren’t being overly optimistic.” Tr. 3/19/2022 at 1:00:44

28. At the conclusion of the meeting, the Commission authorized the co-chairs to make recommendations to the Commission regarding hiring independent mapdrawers and mediators. And the Commission scheduled three upcoming meetings: Sunday, March 20 at 7:00pm (if needed); Monday, March 21 at 7:00pm, and Tuesday, March 22 at 9:00am.

29. **Sunday, March 20, 2022.** I immediately began the work of securing independent mapmakers. On Sunday, March 20, my staff or I had calls with four different mapmakers.

30. Along with Leader Russo and several of our staff, I also had a Zoom call that morning with Professor Michal McDonald about his availability to participate in the mapdrawing process as an independent mapdrawer.

31. In the afternoon, I spoke with Nate Persily, a professor at Stanford Law School. Dr. Persily was only willing to undertake this project if he were selected as the only mapdrawer by the leadership from both caucuses.

32. At approximately 1:00pm, I had a telephonic meeting with Mr. Grofman and Mr. Trende. Attorney General Yost, Leader Russo, and several staff members were also present. I understood from Yost that President Huffman and Co-Chair Speaker Cupp were having a similar call with Mr. Grofman and Mr. Trende later that afternoon. Although I had concerns about Mr. Trende, given his previous involvement in this matter as an expert for the Republican Commissioners, I agreed to go forward with these two independent mapdrawers. Given that the

Attorney General had already vetted these two mapdrawers and given that they had worked together successfully in Virginia, I felt it most important that we start the drafting process immediately, so I agreed with these recommendations.

33. I also moved forward with getting suggestions for a mediator. I reached out to Nancy Rogers, esteemed former dean of The Ohio State University Moritz College of Law and former Attorney General, for her suggestions for potential mediators. She provided me with a list of nationally acclaimed mediators and also said she would contact the chief mediator at the Sixth Circuit's mediation office. The chief judge of the Sixth Circuit gave permission to the mediators for the Commission to use their services. Chief Judge Sutton's letter regarding mediation is attached as Exhibit C. Subsequently, the Commissioners unanimously agreed to those mediators.

34. At approximately 3:00pm, Co-Chair Cupp informed me that he did not want to go forward with the 7:00pm meeting that night. He had suggested as much at an 11:00 call earlier that morning, when he said he had not heard back from the other Republican Commissioners about their availability for the scheduled 7:00pm meeting. But I had stressed the need for the Commission meeting. In the 3:00pm call, Co-Chair Cupp said he had a 4:30pm meeting scheduled with Mr. Grofman and Mr. Trende and did not know if a 7:00pm meeting was feasible. I suggested delaying the meeting to 8:00pm if necessary. Ultimately, at approximately 4:15pm, Co-Chair Cupp called me again to say it was not feasible to go forward with the meeting and that the Republican Commissioners, even after two days, did not have sufficient information about Mr. Grofman and Mr. Trende. The meeting was canceled.

35. That evening, I requested that the Senate Minority legal counsel draft a letter to the Commission announcing that Leader Russo and I supported hiring Mr. Grofman and Mr. Trende



in the interests of time and compromise. That letter, attached as Exhibit D, was sent to all the Commissioners at approximately 6:30pm.

36. **Monday, March 21, 2022.** Given that Co-Chair Cupp had told me that the Sunday meeting was not feasible, I was determined to ensure that the Commission, going forward, met every day. Along with Leader Russo, I sent a letter to the other Commissioners proposing a daily meeting schedule through March 28. That letter is attached as Exhibit E.

37. Despite my and Leader Russo's agreement to using Mr. Grofman and Mr. Trende, at the Monday, March 21 Commission hearing, the Republican Commissioners announced that they did not want to move forward with that team, but instead proposed Dr. Douglas Johnson from the National Demographics Corporation, as their selected independent mapdrawer. Given that Mr. Grofman expressed that his availability during the week may be limited for personal reasons, Leader Russo and I suggested Dr. Michael McDonald, a professor from the University of Florida, as our selected independent mapdrawer. The two would work together in drafting a new plan for the Commission's consideration, with the assistance of the Commissioners' staff.

38. Although the two had been selected, Co-Chair Cupp still wanted to delay. Rather than formally approve these two independent mapdrawers—so that they could get on flights to Columbus the next morning—Co-Chair Cupp suggested talking to the proposed mapdrawers over the next couple days about the specific details of an arrangement and learning the precise rules for the state signing a contract (which the Auditor did not offer), and settling other details. Tr. 3/21/2022 at 33:05. To avoid delay, Leader Russo and I formally moved and pushed for a recess so that members could study the choices and get the answers to Co-Chair Cupp's questions. Republican members suggested that they should instead wait until the morning. *Id.* at 39:52. But upon our urging, the Commission recessed for an hour.

39. Upon resuming the meeting, the Commission approved hiring the two independent mapmakers.

40. **Tuesday, March 22, 2022.** At the 9:00am meeting, the Commission established a daily meeting schedule through March 28, which the public could attend virtually or in person. Additionally, upon my request, the Sixth Circuit's mediation office presented to the Commission about their services and mediation in general.

41. Throughout the rest of the day, I directed my staff to work on ensuring that everything was ready for the mediators to get to work when they arrived. (Dr. McDonald arrived late Tuesday night, and Dr. Johnson arrived mid-day on Wednesday.) Democratic staff sought input on contracts and conflicts from the Legislative Service Commission and the Ohio Attorney General's Office and, with input from House Majority Counsel, later drafted a retention letter for Dr. McDonald and Dr. Johnson. Democratic staff worked on other logistical arrangements, such as for appropriate technology, room reservations, and livestreaming.

42. **Wednesday, March 23, 2022.** At my direction, on the morning of March 23, my staff worked to finalize the engagement letters for the independent mapdrawers and, with Co-Chair Cupp's consent, emailed the independent mapdrawers formalizing their engagement, clarifying expectations for appearance at that evening's Commission meeting, and offering to answer questions and provide them with any assistance. These engagement letters are attached as Exhibit F.

43. Prior to the 5:00pm meeting, the Republican Commissioners circulated proposed ground rules for the independent mapdrawing process. Leader Russo and I examined that proposal and made some suggestions.

44. At the meeting that evening, Dr. McDonald and Dr. Johnson spoke to the Commission about their needs and preferences for undertaking the mapdrawing process—including on topics about data sets, numbers of computers, and mapdrawing software. With their input, the Commissioners discussed and voted on each ground rule. The finalized ground rules are attached as Exhibit G. Among others, the ground rules required the independent mapdrawers, using Maptitude software and new computers provided by the Commission, to: draft an entirely new General Assembly district plan at the direction of the Commission and in accordance with the Ohio Constitution and the Court’s orders; answer to the Commission members; and not consider district plans or work product produced before March 23.

45. Finally, at about 7:40pm—a full week after the Supreme Court’s order—the independent mapdrawers were hired and authorized to get to work.

**The Independent Mapdrawers, following a Transparent and Collaborative Process,  
Worked Diligently to Complete a Constitutional Map.**

46. **Thursday, March 24, 2022.** The mapdrawers commenced their work on Thursday, March 24 first thing in the morning. At approximately 8:00am, the Ohio Channel began to livestream the “workroom”—a committee room at the Capitol that was set up for the mapdrawers. Legislative staff set up computers and downloaded the necessary software. There were some delays in getting the proper data in the software program, as the Commission’s ground rules required data that did not have any race-based statistics. Once these issues were resolved, the mapmakers got to work.

47. Though belated, the independent mapdrawing process occurred in a collaborative and transparent fashion. I observed their work both by visiting the workroom and via the livestream. Dr. McDonald and Dr. Johnson each had separate computers where they could draft and try out ideas. They sat next to each other and chatted frequently. They suggested different

ideas, each pursuing different suggestions not based on partisan advantage or hidden motives, but in a pure attempt to see what would work. Sometimes they encountered dead ends and would have to try to draw parts of the map again, though they relied on the Commissioners' previously hired mapdrawers—Mr. Chris Glassburn and Mr. Randall Routt from the Democrats, and Mr. Ray DiRossi and Mr. Blake Springhetti from the Republicans—to help avoid pitfalls. They were developing a truly independent map, in public, with no single party pulling strings behind the scenes.

48. At the Commission's 7:00pm meeting, the independent mapdrawers provided an update on their progress to the Commission and then got back to work.

49. **Friday, March 25, 2022.** On Friday, March 25, 2022, the independent mapdrawers continued to work diligently and made progress toward completing a plan. There was no indication that they would not finish on time or would be unable to comply with the Court's orders.

50. The Commission met at 2:00pm. The mapdrawers provided the Commission with an update, and the Commission discussed specifics, including alternatives for Franklin County pairing. Yet the Republican Commissioners bogged down the process by repeatedly stressing compliance with sections of the Ohio Constitution already being adhered to and by emphasizing compactness and diminishing section 6(B), which demands proportional representation based on ten years of statewide election results.

51. Following the meeting, I received a memo from Co-Chair Cupp regarding new instructions that the Republican Commissioners wanted to give to the mapdrawers from the Co-Chairs. To me, the proposal read like a mechanism to slow down the mapdrawing process, was unnecessarily redundant of what had already been requested in the last Commission meeting, and gave more power to the majority to slow the process down. So, I opposed it. My response in

opposition to the Republican Commissioners' proposals is attached as Exhibit H. The Republican's rules would have:

- Required the mapmakers to provide multiple different options for Franklin County because President Huffman wanted alternatives to what they had drawn.
- Required mapmakers to provide notice of any areas they wanted feedback on 90 minutes before the scheduled meeting.
- Prior to drafting a singular plan from both of the mapdrawers together, the mapdrawers would have to present multiple different individual full plans to the Commission and receive feedback before being allowed to present a merged plan.

The Republican Commissioners included this proposal in the minutes at the start of the Commission's next meeting and, although the Commission never formally adopted this proposal, the mapdrawers always attempted to give the Commission as much notice as possible, at least an hour before a meeting, of areas that they wanted guidance on and sent the relevant map files to the Commissioners' staff. And the mapdrawers always welcomed feedback and suggestions about alternatives; indeed, Commissioners would stop by and ask that certain areas be drawn in specific ways if possible.

**Over My Objection, the Republican Commissioners Prioritized Protecting Incumbents and Attempted to Derail the Independent Mapdrawers' Progress.**

52. **Saturday, March 26, 2022.** By Saturday, March 26—with two full days left before our deadline—each of the mapdrawers had completed a draft House map to present to the Commission. (House maps were completed first because Senate districts are combinations of three House districts.) Both plans had 45 Democratic-leaning House districts and 54 Republican-leaning House districts. Not only had both the Republican-selected and the Democratic-selected independent mapdrawers achieved partisan proportionality, but they had achieved almost perfect

partisan symmetry for competitive districts. Both maps had three Democratic-leaning districts between 50% and 52%; the Johnson map had two such Republican districts and the McDonald map had three.

53. At the 4:00pm Commission meeting, the independent mapdrawers requested feedback from the Commission so that they had guidance before they merged their two maps. For instance, the maps diverged on how they treated Montgomery County and the map drawers sought the Commission's preference. The Commission did not give direct feedback, even after a long recess.

54. By this point it was clear that the independent mapdrawers, if given the guidance needed by the Commission, could timely complete the task. Each had drawn proportional and symmetrical maps, and there were not too many disagreements between the two. The prospect of completion of fair maps seemed to rattle the Republican Commissioners, and they started to impede and discredit the process. They started to complain that the maps were not compact (they were) and that there was insufficient time for public input (which they had never prioritized before).

55. President Huffman's main complaint was that the maps double bunked Republican incumbents. Apparently, he had already forgotten what he had told us at the first Commission meeting on March 19—that we shouldn't consider or prioritize incumbents. Up to that point, the maps had been drawn without any incumbency data, so any resulting districts that had multiple incumbents living within them was a by-product of drawing a constitutional map. But President Huffman would not allow it. He proposed that, before a merged clean map was even drawn, incumbency data be added and that the mapdrawers be directed to avoid placing multiple incumbents in the same district to the extent possible. Though President Huffman's concern started

out targeted at Senators who were in the middle of their terms, it expanded to wanting, to the extent possible, all House and Senate incumbents protected by the new maps.

56. I immediately objected, as did Leader Russo. I was concerned that adding incumbency data would slow down the process and make the maps less compact and symmetrical. Additionally, the Court had warned us about using incumbency data, and the Attorney General, following that opinion, told us it was “improper.” I suggested that the issue go to mediation. At approximately 7:30pm, we began mediating these issues about incumbency.

57. **Sunday, March 27, 2022.** The Commissioners continued to work with the mediator to try to reach a resolution on the incumbency issue. Though I did not want any incumbency data used, I also had to face the reality that the Republican Commissioners have the majority, and they wanted to require the independent mapdrawers to incorporate incumbency into their maps *even before* they had created a single constitutional map without incumbent consideration. To move the process forward, we agreed to a resolution that would allow the independent mapdrawers to draw a clean map first, before tainting it with trying to protect all the incumbents.

58. The final resolution of our mediation was an agreement to instruct the mapmakers, which we did, as follows: “Upon completion of the independent map drawers’ merger of their independent versions of the House and Senate maps and prior to any presentation to the Commission, the independent mapdrawers shall consider the residence locations of non-term limited House and Senate incumbents, and Senate incumbents in mid-term, in drafting a Commission map, and where possible without violating constitutional principles, avoid pairing incumbents and also drawing districts such that Senators protected under Section 5 of Article 11 no longer live in the district they represent. Incumbents will be identified as House or Senate and

no other identifying information shall be used.” See Mediation Agreement—Instructions to Mapdrawers with Regard to Incumbents, as adopted March 27, 2022.

59. At the March 27 hearing, each independent mapdrawer also presented their complete maps. Before combining them, they again sought the Commission’s input. For example, they wanted the Commission’s decision—as they had asked the previous day—as to whether a district drawn that included some of Montgomery County should extend to Green County or to Preble County. The Commission recessed to evaluate the different plans. Yet, even after recess, the Republican Commissioners expressed their opposition to voting to give clear guidance on these issues to the mapdrawers. Several of the Commissioners expressed their informal views, and Leader Russo asked that the mapdrawers move forward with their understanding based on that discussion.

60. That night, after the meeting, my staff informed me that the independent mapdrawers had agreed on a merged plan and were working on cleaning it up for any minor errors (the “Pre-Incumbent Independent Plan”).

**The Republican Commissioners Hijacked the Independent Mapdrawing Process and Passed an Unconstitutional Map Drawn by Republican Staff.**

61. **Monday, March 28, 2022.** By Monday mid-morning, the independent mapdrawers had completed cleaning up the Pre-Incumbent Independent Plan. As they explained to the Commission at the 11:00am meeting, that plan achieved perfect partisan proportionality in both the House and Senate. It also was symmetrical with respect to competitive seats; there were three Democratic-leaning and three Republican-leaning House seats between 50% and 52% in the House; and two Democratic-leaning and no Republican-leaning Senate seats between 50% and 52%. That plan was posted on the Commission’s website.



62. The mapdrawers stated that they would then add the incumbent data, which was being loaded into their computers.

63. When the Commission reconvened in the afternoon, I was pleased when Dr. Johnson and Dr. McDonald announced that they were just a couple of hours away from completing their map, having adjusted district lines (per the Republicans) to protect incumbents.

64. But what I took as a sign of success, was a sign of danger to my Republican colleagues—we could have a fair and independent map. President Huffman announced, for the first time, that to comply with the Court’s midnight deadline, the map actually had to be completed and adopted by 10:30pm so there was enough time to email the data files to the Secretary of State. Then he suggested, because he was concerned that the independent mapdrawers would not meet this deadline, that he would have the Republican mapdrawers tweak the Third Plan so that the Commission could pass that. Though he presented it as a backup “parachute,” in case the independent mapdrawers failed to meet the deadline, it became clear that it was far from just a backup. President Huffman stated that he spoke to Mr. DiRossi and that Mr. DiRossi, despite being sick, was able to work on a separate map. While presented as a last-minute backup plan, President Huffman later admitted to hatching the plan three days earlier.

65. I immediately objected, as did Leader Russo. We explained that such a process would contravene this Court’s orders and the Constitution. I suggested that if we needed more time, we should ask for an extension—not pass another unconstitutional map drawn in a bunker by a partisan Republican mapdrawer. What President Huffman was proposing was, as I said, “ridiculous.” As I stated at the meeting:

“[A]ll the time, money and resources we’ve put into coming up with a constitutional map. We have independent mapmakers. Each of them have drawn separate and apart constitutional maps that comply with the court order. They’ve put together a unified map that just need edits that we can make in this time period to comply with the requirements.

To distract us, the staff, and the independent mapdrawer to divert to some other tasks is ridiculous, contrary to the directive, contrary to the spirit and the direction of the court.

Tr. 3/28/2022 at 50:16

66. The Republican Commissioners were not willing to ask the Court for extra time, even though they passed the Third Plan over a week late. Over my and Leader Russo's dissent, the Commission voted to adopt President Huffman's proposal.

67. Meanwhile, Dr. Johnson worked on completing the plan incorporating the incumbency data. (Dr. McDonald left at 5:00pm because of a class he had to teach the next morning in person in Florida.) At approximately 9:30pm, when the Commission reconvened, Dr. Johnson stated that he needed about 45 minutes to complete the Senate map, and the House map was already done. Therefore, I asked that the Commission recess for one hour to allow Dr. Johnson to complete his work so that we could consider his final plan.

68. But the Republican Commissioners refused. President Huffman announced that Mr. Springhetti—the Republican mapdrawer—had been working on a map (the “Fourth Plan”) and said the Commission should go with that “parachute.” A Republican staff member handed out printouts of the Fourth Plan; the printout included no partisanship data. This was the first time I had seen the plan. Other Commissioners also said it was the first time they had seen the plan. At first glance, it appeared to be a repeat of the Third Plan, and President Huffman explained that it changed the Third Plan only minimally. Despite Leader Russo and my requests, the Republican Commissioners would not recess to allow us to review the map and suggest amendments. The Commission then proceeded to adopt the Fourth Plan by a 4-3 vote, despite the fact that there was no opportunity for any Commissioner to provide amendments, ask questions, or view analyses of the plan.

69. At approximately 10:30pm, minutes after the Commission adopted the Fourth Plan, Dr. Johnson finished the independent map.

70. After adopting the Fourth Plan but with the motion to adopt the majority's 8(C)(2) statement, I recessed the Commission for 30 minutes to prepare the minority's Section 8(C)(2) statement.

71. Upon returning, at approximately 11:00pm, the Commission approved the majority's 8(C)(2) statement. I then moved to adopt the independent mapmakers' final map (the "Incumbent Independent Plan") and have it supersede the Fourth Plan. The Fourth Plan had not yet been sent to the Secretary of State, so it was not effective. (And it was clear by then that, despite President Huffman's earlier statements, it did not take over an hour to prepare files to email to the Secretary of State. Either map's files could be emailed to the Secretary of State at that time.) Looking at the independent mapdrawers' plan, the Republican Commissioners said baldly that they were not compact even though they have a greater compactness score than the Fourth Plan. They said they did not have enough time to review the Incumbent Independent Plan; but they had just voted for the Fourth Plan sight-unseen and had been receiving updates about the independent plan and were able to view its drafting for days. The Commission rejected my proposal to adopt the Incumbent Independent Plan 5-2; only Leader Russo and I voted to complete the independent, transparent, fair process that this Court urged.

### **Conclusion**


72. I worked diligently to get the Commission to adopt a constitutional map, drawn by independent mapdrawers, through a transparent process, alongside Leader Russo. But we only have two votes on this seven-member Commission. Despite our efforts, we were not able to prevent President Huffman and the Republican Commissioners from hijacking the process. I

ultimately voted for the independent mapmakers' plan and against the unconstitutional Fourth Plan. I believe that my efforts, described above, demonstrate that I did not violate the Court's March 16 order and should not be held in contempt.


73. I am hopeful, however, that with strong mandates from this Court we can resume the process with the independent mapmakers and adopt constitutional maps before the federal court takes over on April 20, 2022. I do not believe that the Republican Commissioners, without strong mandates from this Court to give them cover in their party, will abide by their constitutional duty. And I respectfully ask the Court to take such action to protect the Ohio Constitution.

FURTHER AFFIANT SAYETH NAUGHT.

STATE OF OHIO - SS  
COUNTY of SUMMIT

  
Vernon Sykes

Sworn to before me and subscribed in my presence this 3 day of April, 2022.

  
Notary Public



**Exhibit A  
to Affidavit of  
Respondent Vernon Sykes**

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCKET.COM



**STATE SENATOR VERNON SYKES**  
**28th District**

March 17, 2022

The Honorable Robert Cupp  
Ohio House of Representatives  
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Dear Co-Chair Speaker Cupp:

I write today to reiterate what I suggested on our phone call earlier today, that the Ohio Redistricting Commission meet as soon as possible in order to develop a transparent path forward to pass bipartisan, fair, and constitutional state legislative maps.

The Ohio Supreme Court has directed the Ohio Redistricting Commission to start fresh and draw maps that meet constitutional muster. We must do this by March 28. Leader Russo and I stand at the ready and believe following the Court's order is possible if we work together and do not waste time.

It is essential that we call a meeting of the Redistricting Commission as soon as possible to start the map drawing process. The Court has rightly criticized the Commission for its previous delays and inefficient use of time. I hope that we will not repeat that mistake this time – our fourth attempt. I will note that the Commission recently amended its procedural rules to also allow for any three members to call for a meeting of the Commission, rather than only the Co-Chairs. Leader Russo and I are available at any time and would welcome any other Commissioner in calling for a meeting.

The Court also ordered the Commission to meet "frequently" in order to have an open and transparent process to the public. I have suggested to you that we set a schedule and meet at least every other day in order to meet this directive and I offer that suggestion once again. It is critical that we conduct our deliberations and make map-drawing decisions in the light of day and with the opportunity for the public to provide input.

Further, I suggest that the Commission work in a bipartisan manner and hire an independent map-drawer – or alternatively, a mediator – to aid us in our efforts. I believe our staff could work together to identify a list of mutually agreeable individuals to serve in this role.

Ultimately, now is the time for us to work together in order to fulfill the wishes of Ohio voters who overwhelmingly approved these reforms to our redistricting process.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Vernon Sykes", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Senator Vernon Sykes  
Co-Chair, Ohio Redistricting Commission

CC: Members, Ohio Redistricting Commission

**Exhibit B**  
**to Affidavit of**  
**Respondent Vernon Sykes**

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCKET.COM



**MEMORANDUM**

TO: Members of the Ohio Redistricting Commission

FROM: Attorney General Dave Yost

DATE: March 18, 2022

RE: Steps forward following the decisions in *League of Women Voters of Ohio, et al. v. Ohio Redistricting Commission, et al. III* and companion cases

=====

Late in the evening of March 16, the Ohio Supreme Court struck down the third set of state legislative maps. Whether I, or you, agree with the majority in this most recent decision is irrelevant. Four justices have decreed what the rules for this round of redistricting shall be. You are left with little choice but to abide by them. Accordingly, this memorandum outlines a set of steps calculated to address the perceived deficiencies raised by the majority of the Court.

I offer this framework as the chief legal officer of the state, having neither a vote nor a veto over your work. This is not a map of all possible roads to the objective of complying with the elements of the Supreme Court's decisions, but one suggested route. The Commission may choose to devise another. This is offered as a means to commence your discussions.

**Meetings**

The Court made much of the relatively modest number of meetings held before the February 4, 2022 Plan was enacted, and the lateness of their calling. In its most recent order, the Court only gave the Commission ten days to produce a new map, two days of which have already expired.

The Commission apparently has scheduled a meeting for tomorrow--an excellent first step. I suggest that the commission agree at that first meeting on a schedule of meetings, and to publish it. Given that only seven days remain, daily meetings would not be excessive to respond to what some of you have correctly termed a constitutional crisis. I understand one of you has already cancelled an out-of-state trip so as to be available during this period--a commendable and appropriate sacrifice in view of the seriousness of this moment. One or more members may also arrange to participate remotely by electronic means if necessary and agreeable to the commission.



## **Staffing**

The Court directed the commission to hire new mapmakers not beholden to either political caucus. “The commission should retain an independent map drawer—who answers to all commission members, not only to the Republican legislative leaders—to draft a plan through a transparent process.” (at paragraph 30) I note that Court used “should” and not “shall,” but given that this matter is heard in the Supreme Court without meaningful appeal regarding the limits of its authority, it would be wise to treat this suggestion with the degree of deference one might pay to the suggestions of one's spouse.

To assist the commission in this effort, I have retained a bipartisan duo of consulting experts through my office, who together can achieve the level of independent evaluation the court is requiring. I will make them available to the commission as a whole.

Sean Trende, a Republican analyst well-known to the readers of *Real Clear Politics*, or even causal viewers of cable news, and Bernie Grofman, a Democratic professor of political science at the University of California-Irvine, recently collaborated to produce maps for the State of Virginia. Their work was unanimously adopted by the Virginia Supreme Court.

Their charge should be simply to produce a map that complies with the Ohio Constitution and the orders of the Ohio Supreme Court. They understand the time limits of the court, the terms of the Constitution and the decisions regarding it and are prepared to go to work immediately.

Of course, you are not required to use them; I have undertaken to retain them because of the exigent circumstances created by the very short time allowed by the Court. Nor are you required to adopt their maps. It is my hope, however, that you will--their success in Virginia strongly commends them and their work to your consideration.

## **Drafting in Public**

The Court further wrote that the map-making should be done in public. “To promote transparency and increase public trust, the drafting should occur in public.” (at paragraph 44)

The actual map-making is highly technical and performed on a single work-station. I do not read the Court's opinion to say that seven people should be jockeying in a public room to direct the operator of the mouse to do this or that conflicting action.

To comply with the Court's direction, I suggest that the Commission take public actions that achieve the clause seeking transparency and public trust. To that end the Commission could publish any maps at least 24 hours before a vote; meet in public, and receive a progress reports in public from the mapmakers prior to the completion of a map, and discuss in public any sticking points between map drafts or particular districts permutations. I believe a process like this is compliant with the public map making directive issued by the Court.

## **Additional Criteria**

- The Court has now established <52% as the threshold for a "leaning" district; any index less than that is viewed by the Court as a competitive district. The Court will exclude competitive districts from its partisanship calculation. That is, if there are 32 competitive districts, then the remaining 100 districts must closely correspond to the 54 Republican to 46 Democrat ratio the majority has established.
- The Court wrote that efforts to protect incumbents are improper. Such efforts "...can neither be a legitimate and neutral goal nor comport with Article XI, Section 6(A)." (at paragraph 37)
- While competitive districts will not be counted in overall partisan balance, the Court in *dicta* was bothered by the imbalance in the number competitive districts (meaning those with an expected favorable margin of less than 52%) leaning Democratic versus those leaning Republican. While the clustering of Democrats in urban enclaves creates challenges to making Republican-leaning districts more competitive, I would be remiss if I failed to note the Court's observation.

This is meant to be a summary of the major objections in *League III*. The Constitution and the Court's actual opinions are controlling, of course, and my office stands ready to assist the Commission in navigating the multiple and sometimes competing objectives.

Finally, a note about process. I have served on several multi-member bodies, and I've learned it is always a temptation to love too much my own advice, and my own theory of law. I keep this passage from the Ohio Jury Instructions handy, and often review it before meetings:

*It is not wise to immediately express a determination to insist upon a certain verdict, because if your sense of pride is aroused, you may hesitate to change your position even if you later decide you are wrong.*

*Consult with one another, consider each other's views and deliberate with the objective of reaching an agreement, if you can do so without disturbing your individual judgment.*

*Each of you must decide... for yourself, but you should do so only after a discussion and consideration of the case with (the others).*

*Do not hesitate to change an opinion if convinced that it is wrong. However, you should not surrender honest convictions in order to be congenial or to reach a verdict solely because of the opinion of other(s).*

The hour is late, and I do not envy your task. I hope this memorandum has made it easier to "begin again."

**Exhibit C  
to Affidavit of  
Respondent Vernon Sykes**

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCKET.COM

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT**

CHAMBERS OF  
**JEFFREY S. SUTTON**  
CHIEF JUDGE



TELEPHONE  
(614) 849-0134  
FACSIMILE  
(614) 849-0124

March 22, 2022

**VIA EMAIL**

The Honorable Robert R. Cupp  
The Honorable Vernon Sykes  
Co-Chairs, Ohio Redistricting Commission

Dear Co-Chair Cupp and Co-Chair Sykes:

This letter is to confirm that the Ohio Redistricting Commission has engaged the services of the Office of the Circuit Mediators of the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit to provide mediation services. Mediators Catherine Geyer and Scott Coburn will assist the Commission in negotiations to develop a state legislative district map. The expected timeframe of this engagement will begin immediately and continue through the conclusion of the approval process. Mediation services are provided as part of the mediators' services to the Court. There are no fees or expenses to the Ohio Redistricting Commission.

Consistent with the mediation practices of the Sixth Circuit, the Circuit Mediators will not share mediation communications with any judges within the Sixth Circuit, including district judges.

Sincerely,

/s/

Jeffrey S. Sutton

cc: Marc Theriault, Circuit Executive  
Catherine C. Geyer, Chief Circuit Mediator  
Scott Coburn, Circuit Mediator

**Exhibit D**  
**to Affidavit of**  
**Respondent Vernon Sykes**

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCKET.COM



March 20, 2022

Dear Commissioners,

In our meeting yesterday, this commission set out a straightforward task to reconvene, possibly tonight, with recommendations for independent map drawers that could produce constitutional legislative districts. In an effort to aid our work as a commission, Attorney General Dave Yost retained two well-known, independent map drawers of national note, Bernard Grofman and Sean Trende.

The Democratic commission members today spoke with Grofman and Trende, as well as other highly qualified map drawing experts. We are in favor of the commission engaging the Attorney General's suggested mapmakers. We have also been in touch with nationally renowned mediators who could serve later in this process to help the commission finalize a bipartisan, constitutional set of legislative maps.

It is unfortunate that our colleagues were not prepared for a meeting tonight, which was tentatively scheduled for 7 p.m. As the deadline imposed on us by the Supreme Court of Ohio looms, time is of the essence. However, we remain confident that these issues can be resolved at our next meeting, scheduled for Monday, March 21 at 7 p.m., and the map drawing may immediately begin. There is still time for this process to result in the bipartisan, constitutional maps that the people of Ohio expect and anticipate from the commission.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Vernon Sykes".

Senator Vernon Sykes  
Co-Chair, Ohio Redistricting Commission  
Senate District 28

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "C. Allison Russo".

C. Allison Russo  
House Minority Leader  
Commissioner, Ohio Redistricting Commission  
House District 24

**Exhibit E  
to Affidavit of  
Respondent Vernon Sykes**

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCKET.COM



March 21, 2022

Dear Commissioners,

As every member of the Ohio Redistricting Commission is aware, the Supreme Court of Ohio gave us a deadline of next Monday, March 28 to complete our constitutional duty to produce state legislative maps in accordance with the Ohio Constitution and the Supreme Court's orders.

Our Attorney General has offered his opinion that to meet the Court's demand of frequent meetings, that "daily meetings would not be excessive." In that spirit, we propose the following daily schedule for the Ohio Redistricting Commission:

- *The previously scheduled Tuesday, March 22 meeting at 9:00 AM*
- *Wednesday, March 23 at 5 PM*
- *Thursday, March 24 at 4 PM*
- *Friday, March 25 at 10 AM*
- *Saturday, March 26 at 1 PM*
- *Sunday, March 27 at 4 PM*
- *Monday, March 28 at 10 AM*

The above proposal is fair and meets the obligations set forth by the Supreme Court of Ohio and reiterated by the Attorney General.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Vernon Sykes".

Senator Vernon Sykes  
Co-Chair, Ohio Redistricting Commission  
Senate District 28

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "C. Allison Russo".

C. Allison Russo  
House Minority Leader  
Commissioner, Ohio Redistricting Commission  
House District 24



**Exhibit F  
to Affidavit of  
Respondent Vernon Sykes**

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRATDOCKET.COM



## OHIO REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

---

March 23, 2022

Michael McDonald  
Professor, University of Florida  
Department of Political Science  
222 Anderson Hall  
P.O. Box 117325  
Gainesville, FL 32611

Dear Dr. McDonald:

This letter confirms that the Ohio Redistricting Commission has approved the use of your professional services to assist the Commission, and its designated staff, in the timely production of state legislative district maps pursuant to directions provided to you by the Commission.

Your hourly rate is \$450 plus related expenses for all state legislative district map work through March 28, 2022. The wages and expenses are capped at \$49,000.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Robert R. Cupp".

---

Speaker Robert R. Cupp, Co-Chair

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Vernon Sykes".

---

Senator Vernon Sykes, Co-Chair



## OHIO REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

---

March 23, 2022

Douglas Johnson  
National Demographics Corporation  
P.O. Box 5271  
Glendale, CA 91221

Dear Mr. Johnson:

This letter confirms that the Ohio Redistricting Commission has approved the use of your professional services to assist the Commission, and its designated staff, in the timely production of state legislative district maps pursuant to directions provided to you by the Commission.

Your hourly rate is \$450 plus related expenses for all state legislative district map work through March 28, 2022. The wages and expenses are capped at \$49,000.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Robert R. Cupp".

---

Speaker Robert R. Cupp, Co-Chair

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Vernon Sykes".

---

Senator Vernon Sykes, Co-Chair

**Exhibit G**  
**to Affidavit of**  
**Respondent Vernon Sykes**



**OHIO REDISTRICTING COMMISSION**  
**Ground Rules for Map Drawers – As Adopted on 3.23.2022**

---

- 1.) The map drawers shall include the two independent map drawers hired by the Redistricting Commission and Commissioners' staff/contractor map drawers.
- 2.) The independent map drawers shall draft any General Assembly district plan at the direction of the Redistricting Commission and in accordance with the Ohio Constitution and Supreme Court of Ohio's orders.
- 3.) The independent map drawers shall answer to each of the Redistricting Commission members. However, any conflicting direction from the Redistricting Commission members shall be resolved via the mediation process described below. (See Rules 12-16)
- 4.) The independent map drawers shall produce an entirely new general assembly district plan that has not been previously submitted to the Redistricting Commission. The independent map drawers shall not include or consider any general assembly plan proposals or work product produced prior to Wednesday, March 23, 2022 when drafting the entirely new general assembly district plan.
- 5.) The map drawers shall utilize statewide election results and geography from 2016, 2018, and 2020 for the purpose of measuring the partisan lean of individual districts.
- 6.) When considering the election results, Republican votes cast plus Democratic vote casts shall equal 100% of the total vote.
- 7.) Any General Assembly district plan shall be drawn in Maptitude.
- 8.) The independent map drawers shall utilize one computer purchased by the Redistricting Commission to draft any general assembly district plan. Two additional computers may be used for preparation purposes by the independent map makers on site.
- 9.) Racial data will neither be loaded onto the computers nor shall it be utilized by the map drawers in any way.
- 10.) The independent map drawers shall draw a general assembly district plan that conforms with the Ohio Constitution including Article 11, Sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, the Constitution of the United States and applicable federal laws.
- 11.) The independent map drawers shall draw a general assembly district plan that conforms with the opinions of the Ohio Supreme Court and the United States Supreme Court.
- 12.) Should the independent map drawers encounter a disagreement between themselves regarding the application of Art. 11 of the Ohio Constitution and/or the opinions of the Ohio Supreme Court, the issue shall be referred to the full Commission.

- 13.) Should the full Redistricting Commission reach a unanimous consensus, the independent map drawers shall implement the instructions of the full Redistricting Commission.
- 14.) Should the full Redistricting Commission not be able to resolve the issue by unanimous consensus, the issue shall be referred to mediation.
- 15.) Should mediation fail to resolve the issue, the issue shall be presented to the full Redistricting commission for a vote. A majority vote of the Commission shall resolve the issue.
- 16.) The map drawers will then implement the decision of the Commission regarding the disputed issue.
- 17.) Upon adoption of a general assembly district plan the independent map drawers shall complete and file with the Secretary of State, a geographical legal description of each House and Senate district, shape files, equivalency files and county population and filing location for the most populous county in each district, and any applicable Art 11, Sec. 5 Senate assignments in a manner requested by the Secretary of State within ten days.
- 18.) The independent map drawers agree that they have been hired by the Ohio Redistricting Commission, and as such, they owe a duty of fidelity to the Ohio Redistricting Commission. Accordingly, the independent map drawers shall not discuss or communicate with any person, organization, or group – aside from the Ohio Redistricting Commission and the Commission members’ staffs—regarding any aspect of the substance of any redistricting plan. Failure to abide by this requirement may result in the immediate termination of the independent map drawer’s contract along with all available remedial measures caused by the independent map drawer’s breach of their duty of fidelity to the Ohio Redistricting Commission.
- 19.) The meetings of independent map drawers will be held in Room 116 in the Ohio Statehouse. This will be the designated work space for the independent map drawers. No materials shall be taken off site.
- 20.) The Statehouse’s Ohio Government TV will livestream the map making process in Room 116. OGT will stream the map drawers whenever they are working in the room.
- 21.) Commissioners or their designated staff shall have unlimited access to the map drawers, but shall contact both Dr. McDonald and Mr. Johnson simultaneously.
- 22.) The independent map drawers will provide regular progress updates to the Commission at each of the Commission’s scheduled meetings.
- 23.) Commissioners can expect to provide feedback and guidance to the independent map drawers in these meetings in addition to their individual outreach to the independent map drawers as provided in Rule 21.
- 24.) Public access will be only be available in a nearby room where video from the work room will be broadcast.

**Exhibit H**  
**to Affidavit of**  
**Respondent Vernon Sykes**

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCKET.COM

**From:** Rowe, Mike Mike.Rowe@ohiosenate.gov  
**Subject:** Response from Co-Chair Sykes  
**Date:** March 26, 2022 at 1:50 PM  
**To:** Christine.Morrison@ohiohouse.gov  
**Cc:** Paul.Disantis@ohiohouse.gov

MR

Hello Christine,

Here is the response from Senator Sykes to the memo from Speaker Cupp.

Mike Rowe  
Senate Minority Chief of Staff

\*\*\*\*\*

Dear Co-Chair Speaker Cupp,

This letter serves as a follow up to our phone conversation earlier today.

First, I do not believe the proposed memo I received on March 25, 2022 regarding the independent mapmakers is appropriate at this time.

The independent mapmakers have previously agreed to provide different options for Franklin County and President Huffman is welcome to follow up with them any hearing. Under the independent map drawer ground rules adopted by the Commission, each Commissioner has the right to express their views or make requests to the map drawers. They can do so at a meeting or whenever else they want, so long as the Commissioner addresses both map drawers at the same time.

I do agree it is reasonable for the Commission to get information from the map drawers in advance of each Commission meeting. But rather than interrupt the map drawers themselves, I think the map drawers should work with the designated staff of Commissioners to determine how to provide updated information to the Commissioners in advance of meetings. I suggest we present and adopt this revised procedure at the next meeting.

Finally, the map drawers have our instructions and requirements from the ground rules, and I do not believe we should unnecessarily emphasize some instructions or requirements over others. I believe any change to the ground rules is unnecessary at this time.

Sincerely,

Senator Vernon Sykes, Co-Chair  
Ohio Redistricting Commission



IN THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

League of Women Voters of Ohio, *et al.*, :  
 : Case No. 2021-1193  
 Petitioners, :  
 : Original Action Filed Pursuant to  
 v. : Ohio Constitution, Article XI, Section 9(A)  
 :  
 Ohio Redistricting Commission, *et al.*, : [Apportionment Case Pursuant to S. Ct.  
 : Prac. R. 14.03]  
 Respondents. :

---

Bria Bennett, *et al.*, :  
 : Case No. 2021-1198  
 Petitioners, :  
 : Original Action Filed Pursuant to  
 v. : Ohio Constitution, Article XI, Section 9(A)  
 :  
 Ohio Redistricting Commission, *et al.*, : [Apportionment Case Pursuant to S. Ct.  
 : Prac. R. 14.03]  
 Respondents. :

---

The Ohio Organizing Collaborative, *et al.*, :  
 : Case No. 2021-1210  
 Petitioners, :  
 : Original Action Filed Pursuant to  
 v. : Ohio Constitution, Article XI, Section 9(A)  
 :  
 Ohio Redistricting Commission, *et al.*, : [Apportionment Case Pursuant to S. Ct.  
 : Prac. R. 14.03]  
 Respondents. :

---

AFFIDAVIT OF RESPONDENT ALLISON RUSSO

---

State of Ohio  
County of Franklin, SS:

I, C. Allison Russo, hereby submit the following affidavit and state under oath and penalty of perjury as follows:

**Introductory Information**

1. I have personal knowledge of all the information below.
2. I am a member of the Ohio House of Representatives, representing District 24. I assumed office on January 1, 2019. On January 12, 2022, the Ohio House Democratic Caucus elected me as the Ohio House Minority Leader. I was sworn in as Minority Leader during the House's session on January 26, 2022.
3. I serve as a Commissioner on the Ohio Redistricting Commission ("Commission"). I am the only woman on the Commission. I serve as a representative from the Democratic Party, along with Co-Chair Senator Vernon Sykes (together, the "Democratic Commissioners"). The remaining five Commissioners are Republicans (together, the "Republican Commissioners").
4. I was sued in the above-captioned case and am a named Respondent. The Ohio Supreme Court, however, has recognized that my interests align more with the Petitioners than that of the Commission or the Republican Commissioners. Opinion 2022-Ohio-65, ¶ 66. I have urged the Supreme Court to invalidate the Commission's previous General Assembly maps because they violated Section 6, Article XI of the Ohio Constitution.
5. On March 16, 2022, the Ohio Supreme Court declared the Commission's third General Assembly plan (the "Third Plan") invalid and directed the Commission to create a new plan by March 28, 2022. Opinion, 2022-Ohio-789 (*LWW III*).
6. On March 30, 2022, the Supreme Court ordered that "responses, if any," to "petitioners' motion for an order directing respondents to show cause for why they should not be

held in contempt of the court's March 16, 2022 order," be filed by April 4, 2022. I submit this affidavit in response to that order. I have filed three affidavits in this case previously, each detailing my efforts to comply with the Ohio Constitution and this Court's orders. I incorporate those by reference. *See* March 2, 2022 Affidavit of C. Allison Russo; February 23, 2022 Affidavit of C. Allison Russo; January 28, 2022 Affidavit of C. Allison Russo.

7. The Petitioners' motions for an order to show cause accurately describes the Commission's process and actions following the March 16 order. As described, the Commission hired independent mapdrawers (one selected by each caucus), who were drawing maps from scratch, in public, with direction from the Commission which was meeting almost daily. But, just days before that transparent, independent process to develop a constitutional plan concluded—when my Republican colleagues could see that an independent plan would emerge—they attempted to undermine the entire process.

8. The result: just minutes before the independent mapdrawers completed the most final version of their map, Co-chairman Cupp with Senator Huffman's second proposed adopting maps, drawn by the Republican mapdrawers alone, that were over 97% the same as the Third Plan this Court already held unconstitutional. The Republicans would not allow any amendments or even time to review. And, with a vote of four of the Republican Commissioners, the Commission adopted that plan (the "Fourth Plan"). I voted against that plan and instead for the independent mapdrawers' plan.

9. I understand that Petitioners again seek to have this Court hold the Commission and/or Commissioners in contempt. Last time that Petitioners made such a request, the Commission (over my dissent) failed to adopt a map at all even though the Democratic Commissioners and Petitioners had presented constitutional maps that could have been adopted.

This time there is a plan, but, as I said in our March 28, 2022 Commission meeting as the Republican Commissioners again violated their duty to adopt a constitutional map, it was a “farce.” As before, the Republican Commissioners could have adopted a constitutional plan. They had been observing, monitoring, and guiding the independent mapdrawers for days. But they chose not to because it would weaken their supermajority.

10. As detailed below, since this Court’s March 16 order, I worked diligently alongside Co-Chair Sykes to comply with the order. Together, we (1) requested that the Commission meet immediately and often; (2) identified and procured independent mapdrawers and mediators; (3) were willing to work collaboratively with the other Commissioners and their staff on any plans or ideas had they been proposed; and (4) moved to adopt a new constitutional plan prepared in public by the independent mapdrawers. Because I worked diligently to help the Commission produce a constitutional plan, voted for that constitutional plan, and opposed the Republican Commissioners’ last-minute takeover and unconstitutional Fourth Plan, I respectfully request that the Court does not order me to show cause or hold me in contempt.

11. But I do ask the Court to take strong action to ensure that the Commission adopt a constitutional map before the federal court usurps our constitutional process and selects a plan on April 20, 2022. Indeed, that court has indicated that it is even entertaining mandating plans that this Court has held are unconstitutional. With Article XI, the voters of Ohio asked for the Commission to draw fair maps and entrusted the Ohio Supreme Court with both the power and responsibility to protect that choice. It is still my hope that, with this Court’s help, we can fulfill that responsibility to the people of Ohio.

**Immediately After the Court's Order, the Democratic Commissioners Worked Diligently to Arrange for Frequent Meetings and for a New Plan to be Drawn in Public by Independent Experts.**

12.     **Wednesday, March 16, 2022.** As urged by the Democratic Commissioners, the Ohio Supreme Court invalidated the Third Plan in an opinion and order published at approximately 9:45pm on March 16, 2022. Having received notice of the Court's order on Wednesday evening, I hoped that a notice of the Commission's next meeting would be issued post haste, but was prepared to call for one if not, as the Commission needed to reconvene to, once again, adopt new maps.

13.     The March 16 order set forth clear rules and guidance for the Commission that I diligently worked to follow throughout the process. After holding the Third Map invalid, the Court described a process that should be followed. It held that the Commission "be reconstituted" and that "the commission draft and adopt an entirely new General Assembly-district plan." *LWV III* ¶ 44. Based on the Court's explanations, I took this to mean that the Commission itself, rather than the partisan staff who had been drawing maps, had to oversee the mapdrawing process. The map had to be "entirely new"—that is, not start from one of the previous unconstitutional versions. And the Court said that we should hire an "independent" mapdrawer that answers to the entire Commission—not just some Commissioners—"to draft a plan" for the Commission. *LWV III* ¶¶ 30, 44. And it stated that the process should be "transparent," that "drafting should occur in public," and that "the commissioners should convene frequent meetings." *LWV III* ¶ 44.

14.     The March 16 order also made clear the substantive requirements for adopting a constitutional map. It invalidated the Third Plan in part because of the "gross and unnecessary disparity in the allocation of close districts," as the Third Plan had 19 so-called Democratic-leaning House districts and 7 so-called Democratic-leaning Senate districts that were in the 50 – 52%

margin, and no such Republican-leaning House or Senate districts. *LWV III* ¶ 43. That meant, going forward, the Commission needed to draw a plan that met the 45-54 proportionality ratio, as close as possible while complying with Article XI, §§ 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7—but in doing so, competitive seats of between 50 and 52% needed to be symmetrically allocated and not be so one-sided against either party.

15. The Court gave the Commission a deadline of March 28 to file a new plan with the Secretary of State and until March 29 at 9am to file the plan with the Court.

16. **Thursday, March 17, 2022.** The morning after receiving the Ohio Supreme Court's decision that the Commission's maps were unconstitutional and the order for the Commission to draw new constitutional maps, I directed my staff to follow the Court's order, prepare for the Commission to adopt constitutional maps, and make themselves available to the other Commission members and their staff.

17. Because I had not yet seen a notice of a scheduled meeting, I sent a letter to my fellow Commissioners urging that we meet frequently and hire independent map drawers. A copy of that letter is attached as Exhibit A. I received a letter that day from Co-Chair Sykes calling for immediate and frequent meetings as well.

18. I also wrote to Senator Robert McColley on March 17 to arrange for the Legislative Task Force on Redistricting Co-chairs to allocate whatever funding might be necessary to the Commission to engage independent map drawers. Senator McColley and I serve as co-chairs of that Task Force, and from that role I knew (as I had said at multiple Commission meetings) that there were ample funds to hire experts and other support for the Commission.

19. **Friday, March 18, 2022.** On Friday, March 18, I was pleased to see that the Commission co-chairs had noticed a Commission meeting at 2:00pm the next day.

20. I also received a memo sent to all Commissioners by the Attorney General that evening, which is attached as Exhibit B. The Attorney General, in his role as “chief legal officer of the state,” took the opportunity to explain the March 16 order to the Commissioners and make recommendations about “steps forward.” Yost encouraged daily meetings and drafting in public. He also states that “[t]he Court directed the commission to hire new mapmakers not beholden to either political caucus,” and, to that end, explained that he had retained Sean Trende, a Republican analyst, and Bernie Grofman, a Democratic professor of political science, to help in the mapdrawing process. The pair had just completed state legislative maps that are now being implemented in Virginia.

21. As to the substance of drawing a plan, the Attorney General also told us that districts that were drawn to have between 50% and 52% partisan slant were considered “competitive” districts and could not be counted as Democratic or Republican leaning; they are “exclude[d]” from the proportionality calculation. He also warned that “efforts to protect incumbents are improper.”

22. I was encouraged by this memorandum, as I believed it set forth some important steps the Commission needed to take and provided a clear and faithful interpretation of the Court’s order. If the Republican Commissioners were willing to follow their own Attorney General’s advice and interpretation, we could adopt a constitutional map.

23. **Saturday, March 19, 2022.** On Saturday, March 19, 2022, the Commission reconvened for the first time since the Court’s order invalidating the Third Plan. The Commission tentatively agreed to retain independent mapdrawers—one selected by each caucus—who would be charged with drawing a plan that was compliant with the Ohio Constitution and this Court’s orders. And there was consensus, including several statements from Governor DeWine, that the

independent mapdrawers should just be ordered to follow the Ohio Constitution and the Court's three decisions, Tr. 3/19/2022 at 00:40:14, 01:15:47, nothing else. President Huffman, acknowledging that the Court had singled him out for his previous prioritizing of incumbency, stated: "I think [prioritizing incumbency] was also criticized by the court [and] that we should not consider incumbency in drawing these maps. So I just want to kind of get that out." Tr. 3/19/2022 at 46:22.

24. The Commission decided to empower the co-chairs to prepare a recommendation for a pair of mapdrawers. I expressed concern that the Commission itself, rather than the Attorney General, should hire independent mapdrawers; as it was our duty in the Constitution and as articulated by the Court. I also expressed concern that Mr. Trende, one of the experts the Attorney General had selected, had already appeared as an expert witness for the Republican Commissioners in this very case. While I explained that any expert was going to have bias and have appeared in the past for previous political parties or advocacy groups, I was concerned about direct conflicts of interest in this same matter. But I did not close the door on the Attorney General's recommendation and kept an open mind; it was important that we move quickly to get independent mapdrawers working.

25. Also at the March 19 meeting, the Commission scheduled meetings each day through Tuesday, March 22, and the Commission directed all the Commissioners' staff to work together over the weekend until independent mapdrawers were hired.

26. I believed the Commission meeting went well, but I was concerned by Co-chair Cupp's comments that other Commissioners seemed excessively optimistic. Tr. 3/19/2022 at 1:00:44. Likewise, while I was encouraged by Governor DeWine's comments emphasizing the Commission's duty to adopt maps and follow the Court's orders, I was also concerned by the



Governor's comments suggesting that it might not be possible to draw a constitutional map. I believed and still believe that maps complying with Article XI, Sections 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7, and 6 can be created in a relatively short period of time and well within the time frames ordered by the Court. The record clearly shows it is achievable. But I felt apprehensive because of the three previous refusals of Republican Commissioners to follow the dictates of our state constitution. And even at this first meeting, the Republican Commissioners were planting the seeds for the process to fail; saying that there would not be enough time (there was) or that a constitutional map satisfying the Court's orders was impossible (it's not). But I also felt excited to try again, finally with a process the people deserved: independent mapdrawers whose work would be livestreamed to the public. I knew we could adopt constitutional maps and pressed forward despite signals from some Republican Commissioners that they might run the same playbook of denial, delay, and dereliction.

27. I asked my staff to identify potential independent mapdrawers and attempt to set up meetings so we could have multiple options.

28. After the Commission meeting, at around 6:00pm, Mr. Randall Routt contacted all Commissioners' staff letting them know he, Democratic contractor Chris Glassburn, and my staff were available to meet over the weekend as the Commission had just directed.

29. **Sunday, March 20, 2022.** I proceeded with identifying and meeting with potential independent mapdrawers, as I wanted the Commission to retain a pair of mapdrawers to start as soon as possible. My staff set up calls with Nathaniel Persily and Michael McDonald in the morning. The Attorney General scheduled a call for Co-Chair Sykes and me to meet his recommended experts Bernard Grofman and Sean Trende in the afternoon. Dr. Persily indicated that he was available but only as a solo independent mapdrawer. Dr. McDonald indicated he would

be available and could work in a pair and in public with another mapping professional selected by the other Commission members if needed. Mr. Grofman and Mr. Trende indicated that they could work well together and complete Ohio maps in a short time, but they had some schedule limitations and Mr. Grofman could not be in Ohio in person.

30. Despite my concerns, Senator Sykes and I agreed that we would recommend proceeding with the Attorney General Grofman/Trende recommendation because we wanted to move quickly and, given that they had been recommended by the Attorney General, we thought it might be the most acceptable pair to the other Commissioners. We expressed such agreement in a letter we sent to the other Commissioners that day, attached as Exhibit C. We hoped that our agreeability would speed up the process by allowing the Commission to approve hiring experts that night. If the Commission decided against the initial pair, we would proceed with recommending Dr. McDonald.

31. Additionally, my staff reported to me that they met with the other Commissioners' staff for about 90 minutes on this Sunday to discuss what the independent mapdrawers would need to begin and complete their process. My staff described it as an agreeable meeting, and we were ready for the 6:00pm Commission meeting that evening to make our recommendations for mapdrawers. We had an abundance of options and the direction that we as a Commission would give to the mapdrawers seemed clear.

32. Unfortunately, later that afternoon, Co-Chair Sykes informed me that Co-Chair Cupp wanted to cancel that night's meeting because he was not prepared with a mapdrawer recommendation and because many of the Republican Commissioners were not available. I felt confident that independent mapdrawers could complete maps for Ohio quickly, but I was

concerned about what I viewed as an unnecessary delay in getting them started. Senator Sykes and I decided the next morning to insist that all scheduled meetings go forward.

33. **Monday, March 21, 2022 — Wednesday, March 23, 2022.** During the early part of the week, the Commission made progress on setting up an independent and transparent mapdrawing process. It made progress in several ways:

34. *First*, the Commission retained two independent mapdrawers; one selected by each caucus. On Monday, March 21, 2022, I learned that the Republicans had decided not to go along with the Attorney General's Grofman/Trende recommendation and instead chose Dr. Douglas Johnson. Co-Chair Sykes and I selected Dr. McDonald, who could arrive in Columbus the next day. The Commission approved hiring these two experts to work together to draft a plan. The Commission also agreed to ground rules for the independent mapdrawers during a meeting on Wednesday, March 23. By those rules, the mapdrawers were instructed to draw maps from scratch (not based on previous plans) that complied with the Ohio Constitution and the Court's orders—no other considerations were included. The rules set up a transparent process where Democratic and Republican staff could always be present, and the public could view the workroom via livestream.

35. *Second*, the Commission decided to utilize mediators. Co-Chair Sykes had been working on identifying potential mediators to aid the Commission in case of disagreements between the members or disagreements between the mapdrawers. At the Monday, March 21, 2022 meeting, at Co-Chair Sykes' invitation, the Commission heard a presentation from the Sixth Circuit's Chief Mediator, and the next day the Commission decided to utilize the Sixth Circuit's mediation office to resolve disputes should any arise. My staff and I met with the mediators to have introductory conversations and learn about the mediation process.

36. *Third*, the Commission adopted a schedule of daily meetings extending the Court's March 28 deadline. The Commission also engaged the Sixth Circuit mediators to assist the Commission where needed in the days ahead. Later that evening, Dr. McDonald arrived in Ohio.

37. Throughout each of these days, my goal was to keep the process moving as quickly as possible while complying with the constitution and this Court's orders. That meant while I may have preferred different ground rules or different processes, I held my objections to a minimum to facilitate the completion of this process. I truly believed that the Commission could adopt a constitutional map through a transparent process with independent mapmakers. At the same time, however, based on their past actions, I was worried that my fellow commissioners might sabotage or abandon this new process at any time.

**The Independent Mapdrawers, following a Transparent and Collaborative Process,  
Worked Diligently to Complete a Constitutional Map.**

38. **Thursday, March 24, 2022.** The mapdrawers commenced their work on Thursday, March 24. At approximately 8:00am, the Ohio Channel began to livestream the "workroom"—a committee room at the Capitol that was set up for the mapdrawers. Legislative staff set up computers and installed the necessary software. There were some delays in getting the proper data in the software program, and my staff reported to me that the Republican mapmakers were not being helpful in resolving these issues. But once these issues were resolved, the mapmakers got to work.

39. I directed my staff to make sure that either Mr. Glassburn or Mr. Routt were always in the workroom with the independent mapdrawers to provide any assistance requested.

40. At the Commission's 7:00pm meeting, the mapdrawers provided an update on their progress to the Commission, then got back to work.

41. **Friday, March 25, 2022.** The independent mapdrawers continued to work diligently and made progress toward completing a plan. There was no indication that they would not finish on time or would be unable to comply with the Court's orders. Quite the opposite, though belated, I was finally seeing an independent and transparent process to draw maps that were compliant with the constitution and not designed to entrench the Republicans' supermajority. The fair process that Ohio voters had asked for was taking shape. I observed the independent mapmaking process both by visiting the workroom and via the livestream. Dr. McDonald and Dr. Johnson each had separate computers where they could draft and try out ideas. They sat next to each other and chatted frequently. They suggested different ideas, each pursuing different suggestions not based on partisan advantage or hidden motives, but in a pure attempt to just see what would work. They were developing a truly independent map, in public, with no single party pulling strings behind the scenes.

42. While the independent mapdrawers were making good progress and following the Commission's ground rules, it was clear that my Republican colleagues were becoming frustrated by the possibility that it would be successful. Our Commission meetings became filled with Republican complaints about printouts not being large enough, maps not being shared long enough in advance before meetings, not enough options for each region being provided, and not enough Commissioner input. Yet, each time the independent mapdrawers asked for guidance, the Commission refused to give it. Even if we recessed to have more time to look at proposed options, the Commissioners still refused to provide the requested guidance.

**Over My Objection, the Republican Commissioners Prioritized Protecting Incumbents and Attempted to Derail the Independent Mapdrawers' Progress.**

43. **Saturday, March 26, 2022.** By Saturday, March 26—with two full days left before our deadline—each of the mapdrawers had completed a draft House map to present to the

Commission. (House maps were completed first because Senate districts are combinations of three House districts.) Both plans had 45 Democratic-leaning House districts and 54 Republican-leaning House districts. Not only had both the Republican-selected and the Democratic-selected independent mapdrawers achieved partisan proportionality, but they had achieved almost perfect partisan symmetry for competitive districts. Both maps had three Democratic-leaning districts between 50% and 52%; the Johnson map had two such Republican districts; and the McDonald map had three.

44. At the 4:00pm Commission meeting, after hearing the update from the independent mapdrawers, it was clear that they could timely complete the task. Each had drawn proportional and symmetrical maps, and there were not too many disagreements between the two.

45. The Republican Commissioners, however, seemed to want to obstruct and discredit the independent process in any way possible. The Republican Commissioners, for example, started to complain that the maps were not compact (they were). And President Huffman's main complaint was that the maps placed several Republican incumbents in the same district (a practice he called "double bunking"). At that point, the independent mapdrawers did not have access to any addresses for incumbents; so any double bunking was inadvertent and a byproduct of drawing constitutional maps. But President Huffman and the Republican Commissioners indicated that they would never support a map that did not protect their colleagues. President Huffman had apparently already forgotten what he had told us at the first Commission meeting on March 19—that we shouldn't consider or prioritize incumbents. He proposed that, before a merged clean map was even drawn, incumbency data be added and that the mapdrawers be directed to avoid placing multiple incumbents in the same district to the extent possible. Though President Huffman's

concern started out targeted at Senators who were in the middle of their terms, it expanded to wanting, to the extent possible, all House and Senate incumbents protected by the new maps.

46. I immediately objected, as did Co-Chair Sykes. I was concerned that adding in incumbency data would slow down the process and make the maps less compact and symmetrical. The goal was to produce constitutional maps; that was our top priority, not protecting incumbents. And the Court had warned us about using incumbency data and the Attorney General, following that opinion, told us it was “improper.” Co-Chair Sykes suggested that the issue go to mediation.

47. **Sunday, March 27, 2022.** On Sunday, March 27, we worked with the mediator on coming to a resolution of the incumbency issue. Though I did not want any incumbency data used, we also had to face the reality that the Republican Commissioners have the majority, and they wanted—as they stated at the Commission meetings—to require the independent mapdrawers to incorporate incumbency into their maps *even before* they had created a single constitutional map without incumbent consideration. To move the process forward, we agreed to a resolution that would allow the independent mapdrawers to draw a clean map first, before tainting it with trying to protect all the incumbents.

48. The final resolution of our mediation was an agreement to instruct the mapmakers, which we did, as follows: “Upon completion of the independent map drawers’ merger of their independent versions of the House and Senate maps and prior to any presentation to the Commission, the independent mapdrawers shall consider the residence locations of non-term limited House and Senate incumbents, and Senate incumbents in mid-term, in drafting a Commission map, and where possible without violating constitutional principles, avoid pairing incumbents and also drawing districts such that Senators protected under Section 5 of Article 11 no longer live in the district they represent. Incumbents will be identified as House or Senate and

no other identifying information shall be used.” *See* Mediation Agreement—Instructions to Mapdrawers with Regard to Incumbents, as adopted March 27, 2022.

49. At the March 27 hearing, each independent mapdrawer also presented their plans. Before combining them and producing a unified set of maps, they sought the Commission’s input again. There were multiple different options the Commission could select and get a constitutional result, and the Commission could choose. For example, they wanted the Commission’s decision—as they had asked the previous day—as to whether a district drawn that included some of Montgomery County should extend to Greene County or to Preble County. The Commission recessed to evaluate the different plans. Upon returning from the recess, I moved that the Commission provide direction to the independent mapdrawers about the various areas they had given us choices about.

50. Yet, even after recess and time to consider the various proposals, the Republican Commissioners opposed voting to give clear guidance on these issues to the mapmakers. Several of the Commissioners expressed their informal views, and then I asked that the mapmakers move forward with their understanding based on that discussion. In my view, it was hypocritical that the Commissioners had been asking for options and choices, and then when presented with options and choices that would be constitutional, the Republican Commissioners would not provide feedback. But I did not want these choices—or lack thereof—to delay the independent mapdrawers’ work, so I asked them to continue.

**The Republican Commissioners Abandoned the Independent Process and Refused to Fulfill Their Obligation to Adopt a Constitutional Map.**

51. **Monday, March 28, 2022.** On Monday morning, my staff informed me that the independent mapmakers had decided on a unified plan and were working to ensure that it did not have any technical errors. As they explained to the Commission at the 11:00am meeting, that plan



achieved perfect partisan proportionality in both the House and Senate. It also was symmetrical with respect to competitive seats; there were three Democratic-leaning and three Republican-leaning House seats between 50% and 52%; and two Democratic-leaning and no Republican-leaning Senate seats between 50% and 52%. That plan (the “Pre-Incumbent Independent Plan”) was posted on the Commission’s website.

52. The goal of creating a constitutional map had been achieved. And the mapmakers stated that, before the Court’s deadline, they would add the incumbent data, which was being loaded into their computers, and alter the map to unpair as many incumbents as possible without violating any of the constitutional requirements.

53. The Commission met again in the afternoon to review the independent mapdrawers’ progress. Dr. Johnson and Dr. McDonald announced that they were just a couple of hours away from completing the new maps that adjusted district lines to protect incumbents.

54. The prospect of the independent mapdrawers’ success was not welcome by my Republican colleagues. Rather than encourage the mapdrawers to finish and let them complete the task of protecting all the incumbents (as the Republican Commissioners had asked), the Republicans—led by President Huffman—pulled a bait-and-switch. President Huffman announced for the first time that to comply with the Court’s midnight deadline, the map actually had to be completed and adopted by 10:30 so there was enough time to email the data files to the Secretary of State. Then he suggested, because he was concerned that the independent mapdrawers would not meet this new deadline, that Republican mapdrawers (Mr. DiRossi and Mr. Springhetti) tweak the Third Plan so that the Commission could pass that. Though he presented it as a backup “parachute” in case the independent mapdrawers failed to meet the deadline, it was clear that it was far from just a backup plan. Indeed, President Huffman had already spoken to an infirm Mr.

DiRossi, who was holed up at the BWC building and able to work on a separate map. And while he presented it as a last-minute backup plan, President Huffman later admitted to hatching the plan three days earlier.

55. Co-chair Sykes immediately objected, and I echoed his outrage. We explained that such a process would contravene this Court's orders and the Constitution. I suggested that if we needed more time, we should ask for an extension—not pass another unconstitutional map drawn in a bunker by a Republican mapdrawer. The Republicans were not willing to ask the Court for extra time, even though they passed the Third Plan over a week late. Over Co-chair Sykes' and my emphatic dissent, the Commission voted to adopt President Huffman's proposal.

56. Meanwhile, Dr. Johnson worked on completing the plan incorporating the incumbency data. (Dr. McDonald left at 5:00pm because of a class he had to teach the next morning in person in Florida.)

57. Later in the evening, I visited the workroom to inquire as to when the independent map would be complete. I was surprised to see that Mr. Springhetti was now working on a computer at the independent mapdrawers' table. He appeared to be working on the Third Plan and moving precincts around, but it did not look like much was changing. Mr. Springhetti was not interacting with anyone about whatever he was doing with the map on his screen.

58. At approximately 9:30pm, when the Commission reconvened, Dr. Johnson stated that he needed about 45 minutes to complete the Senate map, and the House map was already done. Therefore, the Democratic Commissioners asked that the Commission recess for one hour to allow Mr. Johnson to complete his work so that we could consider his final plan. But the Republican Commissioners refused. We again asked that the Commission request more time from the Court, noting that the language that the Republican Commissioners had read saying that no

extensions were allowed was applicable to the objections. Certainly, I felt, the Court would want us to have another few hours to work (indeed, at least until the Court opened in the morning) rather than have the Commission adopt yet another unconstitutional map. But the Republicans refused.

59. President Huffman announced that Mr. Springhetti—the Republican mapdrawer—had been working on a map (the “Fourth Plan”) and said the Commission should go with that “parachute.” A Republican staff member passed out printouts of the Fourth Plan; the printout included only information about population deviation in each district. It included no partisanship information or compactness information. This was the first time I had seen the plan. I asked the other Commissioners when they had received this Fourth Plan; other Commissioners also said it was the first time they had seen the plan.

60. President Huffman and Co-Chair Cupp explained that this Fourth Plan changed the Third Plan only minimally; they admitted that it was 97% to 98% similar. The Republican Commissioners would not recess so that the Democratic Commissioners could review the map and suggest amendments. As I said at the meeting, it was a “farce.” In the Third Plan there were 19 competitive districts that the Republicans erroneously counted as “Democratic-leaning” (and no competitive Republican-leaning seats) In the Fourth Plan, there were 17—it was still grossly asymmetrical. None of the Republican Commissioners would even attest that the Fourth Plan was constitutional. Co-Chair Cupp’s defense was it was the “best that can be done in the time that is available.” But that was patently false—the mapmakers had already drawn a constitutional Pre-Incumbent Independent Plan and would be ready in a matter of minutes with the Incumbent Independent Plan. The Commission then proceeded to adopt the Fourth Plan by a 4-3 vote. Co-Chair Sykes and I voted against it.

61. At approximately 10:20pm, minutes after the Commission adopted the Fourth Plan, Dr. Johnson finished the independent map. I learned that Dr. Johnson had completed the Incumbent Independent Plan during the Commission's 30-minute recess after the Fourth Plan was adopted, so that the parties could prepare or review Section 8(C)(2) statements.

62. When the Commission meeting resumed at approximately 11:00pm, the Commission approved the majority's 8(C)(2) statement. Co-Chair Sykes then moved to adopt the independent mapmakers' final map (the "Incumbent Independent Plan") and have it supersede the Fourth Plan. I seconded. I explained that the Fourth Plan had not yet been sent to the Secretary of State, so it was not effective. (And it was clear by then that, despite President Huffman's earlier statements, it did not take over an hour to prepare files to email to the Secretary of State. Either map's files could be emailed to the Secretary of State at that time.) I also explained that the Commission did not dissolve immediately after a map is submitted, so if there were any errors that needed to be corrected (no one identified any), that could be accomplished in the following days.

63. The Republican Commissioners launched various unsupported attacks at the independent mapdrawers' plan, attempting to provide cover for failing to vote for a constitutional map borne of an independent and transparent process. Some Republican Commissioners said baldly that the districts were not compact even though they have a greater compactness score than the Fourth Plan. They said they did not have enough time to review the Incumbent Independent Plan; but they had just voted for the Fourth Plan sight-unseen and had been receiving updates about the independent plan and were able to view its drafting for days. The Commission voted against the Incumbent Independent Plan 5-2; only Co-Chair Sykes and I voted to complete the independent, transparent, fair process that this Court urged.

64. The Republican Commissioners have made no meritorious constitutional objection to the independent mapdrawers' maps.

65. As the evening ended, I directed my staff to rest up. We need to be ready to try again. The Fourth Plan is clearly unconstitutional, just like the Third. We need to pick up where we left off with the independent mapdrawers' map. And I have been informed that Dr. McDonald is available to continue the work if any changes are needed to the plans he produced with Dr. Johnson. With this Court's assistance, we can adopt a constitutional plan.

### **Conclusion**

66. Should the Ohio Supreme Court again order me to show cause why I should not be held in contempt, I believe the facts in this affidavit show that Co-Chair Sykes and I honored the Court's orders by doing everything in our power to advance the Commission toward fulfilling its duty to adopt a constitutional map. The facts also show that the Commission could easily have satisfied the Court's order if only the Republican Commissioners had been willing to comply.

67. Since Monday, March 28, no Republican Commissioner or their staff has contacted me or my staff to discuss maps, work on maps, or share any map proposals. They seem sure that, regardless of what this Court does, the federal court will allow them to go forward with an unconstitutional map on April 20. All they must do is continue to breach their duty to follow the Ohio Constitution and this Court's orders while the clock runs out. I firmly believe in the rule of law and the Constitution. The Court should not allow the Republican Commissioners to get away with such dereliction.

FURTHER AFFIANT SAYETH NAUGHT.

C. Allison Russo  
C. Allison Russo

Sworn to before me and subscribed in my presence this 3rd day of April 2022.

Kelly Boggs Lape (inactive 10/21)  
Notary Public

Sec. 147.03 R.C.  
My commission has no expiration date  
Attorney At Law  
STATE OF OHIO



Kelly Boggs Lape, Attorney At Law  
NOTARY PUBLIC - STATE OF OHIO  
My commission has no expiration date  
Sec. 147.03 R.C.

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACY.ORG

**Exhibit A  
to Affidavit of  
Respondent Allison Russo**

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCKET.COM



**STATE SENATOR VERNON SYKES**  
**28th District**

March 17, 2022

The Honorable Robert Cupp  
Ohio House of Representatives  
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Dear Co-Chair Speaker Cupp:

I write today to reiterate what I suggested on our phone call earlier today, that the Ohio Redistricting Commission meet as soon as possible in order to develop a transparent path forward to pass bipartisan, fair, and constitutional state legislative maps.

The Ohio Supreme Court has directed the Ohio Redistricting Commission to start fresh and draw maps that meet constitutional muster. We must do this by March 28. Leader Russo and I stand at the ready and believe following the Court's order is possible if we work together and do not waste time.

It is essential that we call a meeting of the Redistricting Commission as soon as possible to start the map drawing process. The Court has rightly criticized the Commission for its previous delays and inefficient use of time. I hope that we will not repeat that mistake this time – our fourth attempt. I will note that the Commission recently amended its procedural rules to also allow for any three members to call for a meeting of the Commission, rather than only the Co-Chairs. Leader Russo and I are available at any time and would welcome any other Commissioner in calling for a meeting.

The Court also ordered the Commission to meet "frequently" in order to have an open and transparent process to the public. I have suggested to you that we set a schedule and meet at least every other day in order to meet this directive and I offer that suggestion once again. It is critical that we conduct our deliberations and make map-drawing decisions in the light of day and with the opportunity for the public to provide input.

Further, I suggest that the Commission work in a bipartisan manner and hire an independent map-drawer – or alternatively, a mediator – to aid us in our efforts. I believe our staff could work together to identify a list of mutually agreeable individuals to serve in this role.

Ultimately, now is the time for us to work together in order to fulfill the wishes of Ohio voters who overwhelmingly approved these reforms to our redistricting process.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Vernon Sykes", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Senator Vernon Sykes  
Co-Chair, Ohio Redistricting Commission

CC: Members, Ohio Redistricting Commission



**Exhibit B**  
**to Affidavit of**  
**Respondent Allison Russo**

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCKET.COM



**MEMORANDUM**

TO: Members of the Ohio Redistricting Commission

FROM: Attorney General Dave Yost

DATE: March 18, 2022

RE: Steps forward following the decisions in *League of Women Voters of Ohio, et al. v. Ohio Redistricting Commission, et al. III* and companion cases

=====

Late in the evening of March 16, the Ohio Supreme Court struck down the third set of state legislative maps. Whether I, or you, agree with the majority in this most recent decision is irrelevant. Four justices have decreed what the rules for this round of redistricting shall be. You are left with little choice but to abide by them. Accordingly, this memorandum outlines a set of steps calculated to address the perceived deficiencies raised by the majority of the Court.

I offer this framework as the chief legal officer of the state, having neither a vote nor a veto over your work. This is not a map of all possible roads to the objective of complying with the elements of the Supreme Court's decisions, but one suggested route. The Commission may choose to devise another. This is offered as a means to commence your discussions.

**Meetings**

The Court made much of the relatively modest number of meetings held before the February 4, 2022 Plan was enacted, and the lateness of their calling. In its most recent order, the Court only gave the Commission ten days to produce a new map, two days of which have already expired.

The Commission apparently has scheduled a meeting for tomorrow--an excellent first step. I suggest that the commission agree at that first meeting on a schedule of meetings, and to publish it. Given that only seven days remain, daily meetings would not be excessive to respond to what some of you have correctly termed a constitutional crisis. I understand one of you has already cancelled an out-of-state trip so as to be available during this period--a commendable and appropriate sacrifice in view of the seriousness of this moment. One or more members may also arrange to participate remotely by electronic means if necessary and agreeable to the commission.

## **Staffing**

The Court directed the commission to hire new mapmakers not beholden to either political caucus. “The commission should retain an independent map drawer—who answers to all commission members, not only to the Republican legislative leaders—to draft a plan through a transparent process.” (at paragraph 30) I note that Court used “should” and not “shall,” but given that this matter is heard in the Supreme Court without meaningful appeal regarding the limits of its authority, it would be wise to treat this suggestion with the degree of deference one might pay to the suggestions of one's spouse.

To assist the commission in this effort, I have retained a bipartisan duo of consulting experts through my office, who together can achieve the level of independent evaluation the court is requiring. I will make them available to the commission as a whole.

Sean Trende, a Republican analyst well-known to the readers of *Real Clear Politics*, or even causal viewers of cable news, and Bernie Grofman, a Democratic professor of political science at the University of California-Irvine, recently collaborated to produce maps for the State of Virginia. Their work was unanimously adopted by the Virginia Supreme Court.

Their charge should be simply to produce a map that complies with the Ohio Constitution and the orders of the Ohio Supreme Court. They understand the time limits of the court, the terms of the Constitution and the decisions regarding it and are prepared to go to work immediately.

Of course, you are not required to use them; I have undertaken to retain them because of the exigent circumstances created by the very short time allowed by the Court. Nor are you required to adopt their maps. It is my hope, however, that you will--their success in Virginia strongly commends them and their work to your consideration.

## **Drafting in Public**

The Court further wrote that the map-making should be done in public. “To promote transparency and increase public trust, the drafting should occur in public.” (at paragraph 44)

The actual map-making is highly technical and performed on a single work-station. I do not read the Court's opinion to say that seven people should be jockeying in a public room to direct the operator of the mouse to do this or that conflicting action.

To comply with the Court's direction, I suggest that the Commission take public actions that achieve the clause seeking transparency and public trust. To that end the Commission could publish any maps at least 24 hours before a vote; meet in public, and receive a progress reports in public from the mapmakers prior to the completion of a map, and discuss in public any sticking points between map drafts or particular districts permutations. I believe a process like this is compliant with the public map making directive issued by the Court.

## **Additional Criteria**

- The Court has now established <52% as the threshold for a "leaning" district; any index less than that is viewed by the Court as a competitive district. The Court will exclude competitive districts from its partisanship calculation. That is, if there are 32 competitive districts, then the remaining 100 districts must closely correspond to the 54 Republican to 46 Democrat ratio the majority has established.
- The Court wrote that efforts to protect incumbents are improper. Such efforts "...can neither be a legitimate and neutral goal nor comport with Article XI, Section 6(A)." (at paragraph 37)
- While competitive districts will not be counted in overall partisan balance, the Court in *dicta* was bothered by the imbalance in the number competitive districts (meaning those with an expected favorable margin of less than 52%) leaning Democratic versus those leaning Republican. While the clustering of Democrats in urban enclaves creates challenges to making Republican-leaning districts more competitive, I would be remiss if I failed to note the Court's observation.

This is meant to be a summary of the major objections in *League III*. The Constitution and the Court's actual opinions are controlling, of course, and my office stands ready to assist the Commission in navigating the multiple and sometimes competing objectives.

Finally, a note about process. I have served on several multi-member bodies, and I've learned it is always a temptation to love too much my own advice, and my own theory of law. I keep this passage from the Ohio Jury Instructions handy, and often review it before meetings:

*It is not wise to immediately express a determination to insist upon a certain verdict, because if your sense of pride is aroused, you may hesitate to change your position even if you later decide you are wrong.*

*Consult with one another, consider each other's views and deliberate with the objective of reaching an agreement, if you can do so without disturbing your individual judgment.*

*Each of you must decide... for yourself, but you should do so only after a discussion and consideration of the case with (the others).*

*Do not hesitate to change an opinion if convinced that it is wrong. However, you should not surrender honest convictions in order to be congenial or to reach a verdict solely because of the opinion of other(s).*

The hour is late, and I do not envy your task. I hope this memorandum has made it easier to "begin again."

**Exhibit C  
to Affidavit of  
Respondent Allison Russo**

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCKET.COM



March 20, 2022

Dear Commissioners,

In our meeting yesterday, this commission set out a straightforward task to reconvene, possibly tonight, with recommendations for independent map drawers that could produce constitutional legislative districts. In an effort to aid our work as a commission, Attorney General Dave Yost retained two well-known, independent map drawers of national note, Bernard Grofman and Sean Trende.

The Democratic commission members today spoke with Grofman and Trende, as well as other highly qualified map drawing experts. We are in favor of the commission engaging the Attorney General's suggested mapmakers. We have also been in touch with nationally renowned mediators who could serve later in this process to help the commission finalize a bipartisan, constitutional set of legislative maps.

It is unfortunate that our colleagues were not prepared for a meeting tonight, which was tentatively scheduled for 7 p.m. As the deadline imposed on us by the Supreme Court of Ohio looms, time is of the essence. However, we remain confident that these issues can be resolved at our next meeting, scheduled for Monday, March 21 at 7 p.m., and the map drawing may immediately begin. There is still time for this process to result in the bipartisan, constitutional maps that the people of Ohio expect and anticipate from the commission.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Vernon Sykes".

Senator Vernon Sykes  
Co-Chair, Ohio Redistricting Commission  
Senate District 28

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "C. Allison Russo".

C. Allison Russo  
House Minority Leader  
Commissioner, Ohio Redistricting Commission  
House District 24

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

League of Women Voters of Ohio, *et al.*, :  
 : Case No. 2021-1193  
 Petitioners, :  
 : Original Action Filed Pursuant to  
 v. : Ohio Constitution, Article XI, Section 9(A)  
 :  
 Ohio Redistricting Commission, *et al.*, : [Apportionment Case Pursuant to S. Ct.  
 : Prac. R. 14.03]  
 Respondents. :

---

Bria Bennett, *et al.*, :  
 : Case No. 2021-1198  
 Petitioners, :  
 : Original Action Filed Pursuant to  
 v. : Ohio Constitution, Article XI, Section 9(A)  
 :  
 Ohio Redistricting Commission, *et al.*, : [Apportionment Case Pursuant to S. Ct.  
 : Prac. R. 14.03]  
 Respondents. :

---

The Ohio Organizing Collaborative, *et al.*, :  
 : Case No. 2021-1210  
 Petitioners, :  
 : Original Action Filed Pursuant to  
 v. : Ohio Constitution, Article XI, Section 9(A)  
 :  
 Ohio Redistricting Commission, *et al.*, : [Apportionment Case Pursuant to S. Ct.  
 : Prac. R. 14.03]  
 Respondents. :

---

AFFIDAVIT OF CHRIS GLASSBURN

---

State of Ohio  
County of Cuyahoga, SS:

I, Chris Glassburn, hereby submit the following affidavit and state under oath and penalty of perjury as follows:

1. I have personal knowledge of the information below. I am over 18 years of age.
2. I am the President of Project Govern, a company that provides map drawing services and advises on redistricting matters. I contracted with the Ohio House and Senate Democratic caucuses on January 16, 2022, for the purpose of drawing a proportional map consistent with the Supreme Court's January 12, 2022, directives and to provide additional services as needed.
3. I previously provided affidavits in this case on January 28, 2022, and February 22, 2022, detailing my efforts, at the direction of Co-Chair Sykes and Leader Russo, to aid the Commission in adopting constitutional maps. I incorporate those affidavits by reference.

**Leader Russo and Senator Sykes Directed Me to Aid the Independent Mapmakers.**

4. After the Ohio Supreme Court's March 16, 2022 Order, Co-Chair Sykes and Leader Russo instructed me to work with their staff and all the Republican Commissioners' staff in responding to the Court's order that the Commission draft and adopt a constitutional map. I, along with Senate Democratic staff member Randall Routt, provided as much mapping support as possible to the Democratic Commissioners as they worked diligently to adopt a constitutional map.
5. The main support that I provided since the March 16 order was to aid the independent mapdrawers while they conducted their work in drawing new General Assembly maps from scratch. Because the Republican mapdrawers (Mr. Ray DiRossi and Mr. Blake Springhetti) and the Democratic mapdrawers (myself and Mr. Routt) have experience with Ohio's political geography and the Ohio Constitution's mapdrawing requirements, the Commission represented at



its early meetings that it would be helpful for Republican and Democratic mapdrawing staff to be present to aid the new independent mapdrawers. Leader Russo and Co-Chair Sykes instructed me to be in the workroom as much as possible with the independent mapdrawers, answer any questions they had, and provide them with any assistance they requested. That means that I spent from approximately 8:00am to approximately midnight (or even after) each day that the independent mapdrawers worked in the workroom with them, supporting their work.

6. All throughout this time, I was available to answer questions from the mapdrawers in accordance with the ground rules adopted by the Commission on Wednesday, March 23. The rules ensured that all substantive communications about the maps were made in a bipartisan way, with staff from each party present—and all was livestreamed for the public to see.

7. Additionally, I answered questions about mapdrawing and proposed maps from the Democratic Commissioners and their staff.

8. Because I was present at almost all Commission meetings that took place from March 19 through March 28 and at all work sessions of the independent mapdrawers that took place Thursday, March 24 through Monday, March 28, I have personal knowledge of the vast array of events and conversations that transpired during this period. I observed the creation of all maps produced by the independent mapdrawers.

**The Independent Mapdrawers Created a Unified Constitutional Map Without Regard to Incumbents Well Before the Court Deadline.**

9. The independent mapdrawers retained by the Commission—Dr. Michael McDonald and Dr. Douglas Johnson—started work on March 24, 2022, in the morning. The Legislature’s staff set up House Committee Room No. 116 with new computers and a livestream for the public to view all work done.

10. A full week had passed since this Court invalidated the Commission's February 24 legislative maps. But I believed the mapdrawers could complete Ohio House and Senate maps that complied with Article XI, Sections 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7, and 6 in the time left before the Commission's deadline. I was concerned about any delays or obstacles that might arise going forward, and I intended to minimize disruptions to the extent I could by working collaboratively with Commissioners' staff and trying to be helpful to everyone involved.

11. From Thursday, March 24 through Sunday March 27, Dr. Johnson and Dr. McDonald sat side-by-side, just a few feet apart. They worked on separate computers, testing out ideas and familiarizing themselves with Ohio's geography. They were in constant communication with each other. They would discuss ideas. They almost always agreed. They would collaborate on which of them would try different ideas and discuss with one another the results of such attempts.

12. Dr. McDonald and Dr. Johnson provided maps to Democratic and Republican Commissioners' staff whenever either of them had a completed map to share. These maps were uploaded to the Ohio Redistricting Commission's website and supporting documents providing data about the maps were also uploaded to the website. See <https://redistricting.ohio.gov/maps> and <https://redistricting.ohio.gov/meetings>.

13. Based on my observations, the mapmakers worked quickly, diligently, and made good progress. They were both committed to adhering to the Ohio Constitution, the Court's orders, and the Commission's ground rules.

14. By Sunday, March 27, both mapmakers had completed House and Senate maps without any consideration of incumbency data. They were working toward a unified plan.

15. By the evening of Sunday, March 27, Dr. Johnson and Dr. McDonald had made sufficient progress and had received sufficient feedback from the Commission that they decided on a unified plan to work from going forward. They worked into Monday morning cleaning up that map to ensure that there were no technical errors and to make it more compact. The Pre-Incumbent Independent Plan is available here: <https://redistricting.ohio.gov/assets/district-maps/district-map-1173.zip>. This plan met the Ohio Constitution and this Court's proportionality and symmetry requirements to comply with Section 6 while abiding with Sections 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7. The House map had 54 Republican-leaning districts and 45 Democratic-leaning districts. It had 3 Democratic-leaning tossups and 3 Republican-leaning tossups. The Senate map contained 18 Republican-leaning districts and 15 Democratic-leaning districts with 2 Democratic-leaning districts in the 50-52% tossup range.

**Republican Commissioners Directed the Independent Mapdrawers to Incorporate Incumbency Data.**

16. On March 28, following the Commission's direction, the independent mapdrawers worked on altering their unified map to protect incumbents from "double bunking" as much as possible without violating other constitutional rules. Dr. McDonald and Dr. Johnson—after receiving the list of all incumbent addresses from Mr. Springhetti—worked on "geocoding" it such that every incumbent's address would appear as a dot on the map. According to the Commission's rules, the incumbents were supposed to be anonymous, without the independent mapdrawers knowing the name or party associated with any incumbent's address. Only the chamber—House or Senate—was indicated.

17. Strangely, on Monday, March 28, neither Mr. Springhetti nor Mr. DiRossi were in the workroom much, especially in the early part of the day. The independent mapdrawers asked for them to be there as they were the Republican staff with the most mapping knowledge. Dr.

McDonald and Dr. Johnson seemed more comfortable when either Mr. Springhetti or Mr. DiRossi were there so they would have observers from both political parties with detailed knowledge of mapping Ohio, and so when they had any questions, they could get feedback from experienced mapdrawers from both parties. This held up the independent mapdrawers' work.

18. Senator Huffman stopped by mid-day on March 28 and spoke briefly to the mapdrawers. He told them that he and Speaker Cupp lived in Lima and that he himself represented Senate District 12.

19. At approximately 5:00 p.m. on March 28, Dr. McDonald had to leave to make it home to teach the next morning. Also at about that time, Mr. Springhetti came back to the workroom and began to work at the computer station next to Dr. Johnson. Mr. Springhetti, even upon a question from Democratic staff, did not explain what he was doing. He did not speak much with anyone about his work. I remained focused on the independent mapdrawers' work. Mr. Springhetti was present for approximately 45 minutes before he took a thumb drive out of the computer and left.

20. Meanwhile, Dr. Johnson continued his work altering the unified map to protect incumbents. He reported to the Commission at approximately 9:30 p.m. that he needed 45 more minutes. The Commission dismissed him from the meeting to continue working. He then completed the independent mapdrawers' maps (both for the House and Senate) with the incumbency alterations at 10:18 p.m. (the "Incumbent Independent Plan"). I informed Democratic staff that he had finished. There was time to spare before the midnight deadline. We did not have the Commission meeting playing in Room 116, and I did not know then that the Commission was adopting the Fourth Map in a room two floors above us at virtually the same time. That final

Incumbent Independent Plan can be found here: <https://redistricting.ohio.gov/assets/district-maps/district-map-1178.zip>.

21. I emailed the block assignment files and data files showing population and partisan indexes of districts of the Incumbent Independent Plan to the staff of all the Commissioners at 10:32 p.m. Shortly after, I emailed to the same group images of the maps, and shortly after that, I sent a document listing the assignments of House districts to Senate districts and, in accordance with Article XI, Section 5, the assignments of Senate districts to Senators whose terms do not end in 2022. Mr. Routt uploaded all these files to the Commission website at 11:30 p.m.

22. For the vast majority of the dozens of hours spent in Room 116, from my perspective, the atmosphere was friendly and collaborative and highly productive in spite of what I believe were some unnecessary interruptions and delays.

23. The independent mapdrawers created at least two complete plans that satisfy the Ohio Constitution and this Court's orders with respect to proportionality, symmetry, and sections 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7. They are:

(1) The Pre-Incumbent Independent Plan:

<https://redistricting.ohio.gov/assets/district-maps/district-map-1173.zip>

(2) The Incumbent Independent Plan: [https://redistricting.ohio.gov/assets/district-](https://redistricting.ohio.gov/assets/district-maps/district-map-1178.zip)

[maps/district-map-1178.zip](https://redistricting.ohio.gov/assets/district-maps/district-map-1178.zip)

24. Mapping workroom video archives can be found here:  
[https://www.ohiochannel.org/collection-files/ohio-redistricting-commission?collections=110486&keywords=workroom&pageSize=48&start=1&sort=creationD  
ate&dir=asc](https://www.ohiochannel.org/collection-files/ohio-redistricting-commission?collections=110486&keywords=workroom&pageSize=48&start=1&sort=creationDate&dir=asc).

**The Independent Mapdrawers' Maps Meet this Court's Proportionality and Symmetry Requirements While Abiding with Sections 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7.**

25. The Fourth Map, which the Commission adopted, is not constitutional. It is nearly identical to the Third Map and would insulate a Republican majority in extremely safe seats. It is not proportional and lacks partisan symmetry. The Third Map contained 19 Democratic-leaning House districts and 7 Democratic-leaning Senate districts in the range of 50 – 52%, and zero Republican-leaning House or Senate districts in that same tossup range. The Fourth Map also contains tossup districts in this range only on the Democratic side of the ledger—17 in the House and 6 in the Senate.

26. The Incumbent Independent Plan that Senator Sykes and Leader Russo voted for, by contrast, meets the Ohio Constitution and this Court's proportionality and symmetry requirements to comply with section 6 while abiding sections 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7. The independent House map has 54 Republican-leaning districts and 45 Democratic-leaning districts. There are 3 Democratic-leaning tossups and 3 Republican-leaning tossups. The independent Senate map contains two Democratic-leaning districts in the 50 – 52% tossup range.


27. Beyond vague aspersions about compactness, no Commissioner alleged that the independent mapdrawers' maps violated Article XI, Sections 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, or 7. In fact, the Incumbent Independent Plan is more compact than the Fourth Plan. It scores as more compact than the Fourth Map on the Reock and Polsby-Popper scales, two common methods of the dozens of methods used to measure compactness of an area.

**Further Action**


28. I remain open to working collaboratively with any Commissioner, their staff, or member of the public, or the Commission's independent mapdrawers in addressing any actual constitutional violations with the independent mapdrawers' maps. To the extent there are any

technical flaws in the independent mapdrawers' plans (I am aware of none), I believe they could be remedied easily in a matter of hours. There is no reason, from a technical mapdrawing perspective, that the Commission would need more than a single day to review the independent mapdrawers' final plan, assure that there are no technical flaws (or fix any that hypothetically exist), and adopt it.

FURTHER AFFIANT SAYETH NAUGHT.

  
Chris Glassburn

Sworn to before me and subscribed in my presence this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of April 2022.

  
Notary Public



GRANT W. MACKAY  
NOTARY PUBLIC-OHIO  
MY COMMISSION NEVER EXPIRES