



Midwest Mapping Project

Ohio Summary

Full report accessible at:
<http://elections.gmu.edu/Redistricting.html>



The Midwest Mapping Project is directed by Michael McDonald, Associate Professor at George Mason University, and is supported by the Joyce Foundation. The Project examines the potential political and racial consequences of applying redistricting criteria to congressional and state legislative districts in the five Midwestern states of Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin.

Mapping Procedure

Potential congressional and upper and lower chamber state legislative districts are drawn using 2000 population data and are evaluated using 2000 presidential election data. Three research assistants drew congressional and state legislative redistricting test plans following each of these four criteria: (1) Grid districts, (2) Compact districts, (3) Districts respecting county boundaries and (4) Districts respecting census place (city) boundaries. These test plans are not exhaustive of all potential configurations of districts, but illuminate how redistricting may be affected by these criteria.

Ohio Summary

Lesson learned from the mapping exercises include:

- ▶ These redistricting criteria, based on geographic considerations, appear to have predictable partisan fairness consequences that tend to favor Republicans to varying degrees because Democrats are inefficiently concentrated – for redistricting purposes – into urban areas.
- ▶ These redistricting criteria appear to produce more competitive districts.
- ▶ These redistricting criteria appear to have predictable consequences for racial fairness that tend to work against minority representation protections articulated in the Voting Rights Act.
- ▶ Drawing nicely-shaped districts is difficult, if not impossible, because equal population-sized districts cannot be equal geographically-sized. It is difficult to piece together geographically smaller urban districts with progressively geographically larger suburban rural districts.
- ▶ Square or compact districts will conflict with preserving existing oddly-shaped political boundaries, which may exist due to meaningful local political battles.

Interpreting Statistics for Test Plans Presented on Back

“Two-party vote” is the 2000 Presidential vote for the two major party candidates: “Super” is greater than 80%, “Strong” is 80% to 55%, and “Lean” is 55% to 50%. “Bias” is the number of Democratic majority seats minus the statewide two-party vote, a negative value indicates a pro-Republican plan. Majority Black or Hispanic districts have greater than 50% minority Voting Age Population. Averages for three test plans presented for each type of test plan.

Current Districts in Use for the 2000's Decade

Districts	Bias	State Two-Party Vote	% Districts Maj. Dem	No. of Dists.	% Super Rep	% Strong Rep	% Lean Rep	% Lean Dem	% Strong Dem	% Super Dem	Maj. Black	Maj. Hisp.
Congress	-20.4%	48.2%	27.8%	18	0.0%	38.9%	33.3%	5.6%	16.7%	5.6%	1	0
Upper Chamber	-8.8%	48.2%	39.4%	33	0.0%	51.5%	9.1%	9.1%	27.3%	3.0%	2	0
Lower Chamber	-14.8%	48.2%	33.3%	99	0.0%	51.5%	15.2%	5.1%	22.2%	6.1%	5	0

Congressional Test Plans

Districts	Bias	State Two-Party Vote	% Districts Maj. Dem	No. of Dists.	% Super Rep	% Strong Rep	% Lean Rep	% Lean Dem	% Strong Dem	% Super Dem	Maj. Black	Maj. Hisp.
Grid	-11.1%	48.2%	37.0%	18	0.0%	37.0%	25.9%	11.1%	24.1%	1.9%	0.7	0.0
Compact	-1.0%	48.2%	47.2%	18	0.0%	44.4%	8.3%	26.4%	18.1%	2.8%	0.3	0.0
County Splits	-7.4%	48.2%	40.7%	18	0.0%	38.9%	20.4%	18.5%	18.5%	3.7%	0.7	0.0
Place Splits	-7.4%	48.2%	40.7%	18	0.0%	37.0%	22.2%	16.7%	22.2%	1.9%	0.0	0.0

State Senate Test Plans

Districts	Bias	State Two-Party Vote	% Districts Maj. Dem	No. of Dists.	% Super Rep	% Strong Rep	% Lean Rep	% Lean Dem	% Strong Dem	% Super Dem	Maj. Black	Maj. Hisp.
Grid	-7.8%	48.2%	40.4%	33	0.0%	41.4%	18.2%	17.2%	20.2%	3.0%	0.7	0.0
Compact	-6.8%	48.2%	41.4%	33	0.0%	38.4%	20.2%	16.2%	23.2%	2.0%	0.7	0.0
County Splits	-9.8%	48.2%	38.4%	33	0.0%	42.4%	19.2%	10.1%	26.3%	2.0%	0.7	0.0
Place Splits	-11.8%	48.2%	36.4%	33	0.0%	41.4%	22.2%	9.1%	25.3%	2.0%	1.0	0.0

State House Test Plans

Districts	Bias	State Two-Party Vote	% Districts Maj. Dem	No. of Dists.	% Super Rep	% Strong Rep	% Lean Rep	% Lean Dem	% Strong Dem	% Super Dem	Maj. Black	Maj. Hisp.
Grid	-10.1%	48.2%	38.0%	99	0.0%	47.5%	14.5%	10.8%	22.6%	4.7%	4.3	0.0
Compact	-10.1%	48.2%	38.0%	99	0.0%	44.8%	17.2%	12.8%	21.2%	4.0%	4.3	0.0
County Splits	-10.5%	48.2%	37.7%	99	0.0%	45.8%	16.5%	10.8%	22.6%	4.4%	5.3	0.0
Place Splits	-9.1%	48.2%	39.1%	99	0.0%	45.8%	15.2%	12.5%	22.2%	4.4%	4.3	0.0