

## **Division (E)(2) Statement**

This statement describes all the actions that were taken during the creation of this general assembly redistricting plan which do not strictly follow the constitutional criteria for drawing districts, per Article XI, Section 3, Division (E)(2). All actions described here pertain to Section 3, Division (D)(3), in that more than one municipal corporation or township is split per representative district. Each action was the first listed, being the splitting of two townships with populations under 50% of one ratio of representation, per (E)(1)(a), and no other actions were taken which might have violated any portion of Article XI.

In total, 7 municipal corporations and 13 townships are split. The municipal corporations that are split are as follows: Fairview Park in Cuyahoga County (Districts 15 and 16), Independence in Cuyahoga County (Districts 17 and 18), Stow in Summit County (Districts 24 and 36), Clayton in Montgomery County (Districts 40 and 42), Beavercreek in Greene County (Districts 44 and 45), Mentor in Lake County (Districts 64 and 65), and Warren in Trumbull County (Districts 76 and 77). The townships that are split are as follows: Prairie in Franklin County (Districts 10 and 12), Sylvania in Lucas County (Districts 46 and 48), Liberty in Butler County (Districts 53 and 54), McLean in Shelby County (Districts 56 and 57), Moulton in Auglaize County (Districts 57 and 84), Plain in Stark County (Districts 59 and 60), Orange in Delaware County (Districts 67 and 68), Ravenna in Portage County (Districts 77 and 78), Harrison in Licking County (Districts 79 and 80), Violet in Fairfield County (Districts 80 and 81), Mad River in Clark County (Districts 82 and 83), Jackson in Coshocton County (Districts 91 and 92), and Liberty in Jackson County (Districts 98 and 99).

No municipal corporations were split more than once per district.

The districts with townships split more than once are as follows: District 57 (McLean in Shelby County and Moulton in Auglaize County), and District 80 (Harrison in Licking County and Violet in Fairfield County).

Following the rule in Section 3, Division (C)(3), which reads, "Where feasible, no county shall be split more than once," leads to a massive population deficit in the more rural parts of the state, so that many of the districts created toward the end of the process must be near the population minimum in order for all districts to be above the minimum required by Division (B)(1), which reads, "In no event shall any district contain a population of less than ninety-five per cent nor more than one hundred five per cent of the applicable ratio of representation." While great care was taken to ensure that districts were created with the fewest number of splits possible, some splits were necessary for keeping the populations within these population parameters.

The positional relationship of the far western counties to Montgomery County, to the border with Indiana, and to the district created by the excess portion of Butler County along the border of Indiana, as well as the other sparsely populated counties in the northwest corner of the state formed around the population center in Lucas County, means that any districts created in the west central part of the state are going to require some splitting. Due to how these districts were drawn in the past, without much regard to the requirement that they shall be compact, there are also more incumbents than the population of the region allows for. New districts were drawn in such a way as to unseat the fewest number of incumbents possible, as representatives are required to reside in their districts, while also keeping them compact. District 56 was drawn to include an incumbent's seat in Shelby County, as part of that county was necessary to add to Miami County because Miami's population (91.2% of one ratio) is

under but also close to the 95% threshold. District 84 was drawn in the same manner with regard to Allen County (86.7% of one ratio), including another incumbent's seat in Auglaize County, and District 57 was made from the remainder of the area, including another incumbent's seat in Mercer County. The negative statewide population deviation following the creation of districts in densely populated counties resulted in the districts adjacent to these three requiring a portion of Shelby County to exceed the minimum values. With this portion attached, District 83 was created with 120 in excess of the minimum value, and District 82 was created with an excess of 658. Any other combination than the one chosen would have required another division in order for the population deviations to have been within the limits. Likewise, District 56 was created with 1862 in excess of the minimum value, and Districts 57 and 84 were created with excesses of 182 and 68, respectively. It was necessary to add some portion of McLean Township to District 56 in order to connect Fort Loramie to Miami County; however, the populations of both McLean Township (1785) and Fort Loramie (1590) far surpass what would have been allowable from District 57, so only those blocks from the former necessary for connecting the latter were added. The second split was required to bring the populations of Districts 57 and 84 to within the limits, so Moulton Township was divided into portions with roughly equal populations.

The formation of districts surrounding Franklin County is problematic due to the presence of portions of suburban cities sprawling into other counties. For example, along with Franklin County, Reynoldsburg also has portions within Licking and Fairfield Counties, either county of which is required to have a single-county district plus an excess, as their populations are each above 105% of one ratio. Exactly three compact House districts (and therefore one compact Senate district) can be made from Licking and Fairfield Counties by adding Perry, without any extra splitting of counties. However, the two necessary divisions require single-county districts, so that the third district must incorporate both divisions. Due to the upper population limit, this requires a further division at the municipal or township level. District 79 in Licking County ended up being 862 below the upper limit and District 81 in Fairfield County ended up being 627 below it, while District 80 is 1098 below it. A different combination than the one chosen would have required another split, so that there were two violations of the rule instead of one.