



OHIO CONSTITUTIONAL MODERNIZATION COMMISSION

Legislative Branch and Executive Branch Committee

Frederick E. Mills, Chair
Hon. Paula Brooks, Vice-chair

Part II

February 4, 2016

Ohio Statehouse
Room 017

This page intentionally left blank.

To: Members of the Legislative and Executive Branch

From: Sen. Charleta B. Tavares

Date: February 2, 2016

Re: Proposed Amendments to the proposed Report and Recommendation on Congressional Redistricting-- LR 131 0157

This memo includes five suggested amendments to the proposed draft. These amendments include the recommendations Rep. Clyde presented at the prior meeting and three additional amendments to more closely align this proposal with the priorities in Issue 1 through increasing the protection for counties of any size. It appears some of those requirements may have been inadvertently removed when H.J.R. 2 and S.J.R. 2 were merged to create LR 131 0157.

1. Expand the size of protected large counties and townships to be proportional to the proposal within Issue 1-General Assembly Districts.

Amendment: At lines 149, 174, and 195 delete “fifty” and instead insert “thirty”.

Explanation: This change, suggested by Rep. Clyde, increases protection from splits for counties and municipal corporations or townships that are large, but less than a full ratio of representation. Reducing the minimum protection level from fifty to thirty will protect a proportionate number as are protected for General Assembly districts.

2. Amend to protect all portions of municipal corporations and townships from unnecessary splits.

Amendment: At lines 158 and 161 delete “contiguous”.

Explanation: This change, suggested by Rep. Clyde, would result non-contiguous portions of a municipal corporation or township placed in separate districts being counted as a split. It would not change the existing definition that municipal corporations or townships separated on a county line not being counted as a split. Given the relative size of congressional districts, it is not necessary to automatically allow the separation of non-contiguous portions of political subdivisions.

3. Add requirement that counties which are equal in size to the size of a district are maintained as a district.

Amendment: At line 153 after “(3)” insert: “Each county containing population equal to one congressional ratio of representation shall be designated a congressional district.” Then begin a new line and insert “(4)” to renumber the paragraph.

Explanation: This would require counties that are equal to the ratio of representation being included in one district. This is aligned with language in Issue 1 and supports the overall principle of keeping counties whole as a first option.

4. Require in general, that districts be formed by combining whole counties for all counties not just those counties of a certain size.

Amendment: This amendment would take place in two separate places:

- At line 155 before “municipal” insert “counties,” after “municipal corporations” add a “,”.
- At line 179 after “whole” insert “counties,” and after “municipal corporations” add a “,”.

Explanation: Keeping counties whole has generally been considered foundational for a fair map drawing process. Issue 1, H.J.R. 2, and S.J.R. 2 all include this is a general requirement, but it was omitted in the merger. This county focused requirement for more rural areas of the state will result in more equal treatment between municipal corporations and townships in large and small counties. As most districts outside of the major metropolitan areas will span several counties, keeping counties whole as much as possible is an important tool in preventing gerrymandering.

5. Allow one county to be split per congressional district.

Amendment: In line 180 after “one” insert “county and not more than one”.

Explanation: This amendment is related to the requirement to keep counties whole. The general rule is that counties are to be kept whole, but each district can also split one county in addition to the continuing one municipal corporation or township in order to meet population requirements.

Jeff Jacobson Comments
February 2, 2016

General comments: As the primary author/negotiator of the original language in question, I am concerned that the committee's draft and the Clyde amendments are seeing only one half of the balancing we did in the legislative proposal and missing why it was workable.

Our former apportionment system suffered from two main problems: on the one hand, some line drawing rules that were vague and unenforceable; and two, other rules that were specific enough to be enforceable but were unrealistic and unworkable in practice, or exist side by side with other rules that are conflicting. For example, the requirement that no more than one jurisdiction be split sounds great, but when you have some townships cut up into dozens of unconnected bits and pieces through annexation, you might end up with no choice but to have some pieces end up in different districts. Or, as was the case with the previous two apportionments, the rule that you can only have one partial district in any large county (the other districts in that county would have to be completely contained within the county) might conflict with the rule that requires all districts to have populations within a uniform range.

The way the Ohio Supreme Court (and apportionment board majorities) treated the constitution was to regard all the rules, both the vague and the specific, as merely aspirational. In the absence of a hierarchy, the Court refused to punish the violation of one rule when the apportionment board could point to another rule that it was attempting to follow. A lot of the frustration with the old system stemmed from the Court's unwillingness or inability to enforce anything.

To fix these problems, the negotiators focused on a framework that would simplify the rules to be enforced, only focus on those that protected important interests, and create a hierarchy of rules so that if it was impossible or impractical to follow every rule, the board would know which of two rules it was more acceptable to break.

The proposal gave specific sanctions for violations--but in return was stripped of any potentially enforceable rules to enforce "gotcha" situations. For example, one split was permitted when the board determined it was not "feasible" to make it out of whole districts. The phrase "not feasible" is not the same as "not possible": simply because a computer program could find the one possible way to configure a map to avoid a specific split does not make a plan including that split "not feasible." However, the same rule does not apply if there are two splits. Two splits=a violation, unless it was not possible to have one or less. (Despite the existence of a hypothetical way to draw the district and map without the second split, the district might still be OKed if the one-split map had to break another, less acceptable rule to avoid the second split.)

Since the rules now have enforceable sanctions for violations, all the potential "gotcha" proposals were stripped from the final version--including ones you couldn't avoid. For example, when HJR 12 provided that splitting a city because it crossed a county line was permissible, it also provides that if the board chooses to split a city straddling a county line, both pieces are treated as if they were two different cities for the consideration of whether more than one city of split. The negotiators agreed that you can't have a fair system if following the rules in one part automatically triggers a violation of some other part. **But as I mention later, that common-**

sense, plan-saving rule in HJR 12 was changed in the committee's federal proposal in a way that makes it a violation under one rule to follow what another rule requires.

Now, to consideration of the committee proposal and the Clyde amendments:

As drafted, both of Rep. Clyde's proposals would create unnecessary difficulties in constructing a map that does not violate the constitutional provisions.

Rep. Clyde's first amendment to remove the word "contiguous" would require the apportionment board to keep together a city that surrounds a piece of a township, no matter how small the piece, with the entire township. If two or more cities had annexed in a way that left little islands of a the same township, both those cities would have to be kept together with that township. In Franklin County, where one of the townships is now nothing more than two hundred-odd little clumps of houses completely contained by Columbus, you would also have to worry about the rules requiring you to keep the large city intact and splitting the smallest jurisdiction possible.

Speaking of which, requiring that the split occur in the smallest possible jurisdiction (4E1a) is also a potential gotcha and serves no valuable purpose. When you couple that requirement with the need to keep congressional districts of uniform size (which with conflicting federal court cases may or may not require only a very small deviation), you may not have census blocks in a small city that allow you to balance population. You might have them in a bigger city. This provision would require the board to have a supercomputer to check every possible combination of cities into districts to ensure that in districts where a split was needed you would always be able to appropriately split the smallest jurisdiction.

This amendment proposal will make it more likely that the line drawing cannot be done without violating the rules.

The second proposal is even more problematic: The provision currently in the proposal would make line drawing in southwest and northeast Ohio very difficult, as it requires 50% plus ratio counties to be kept intact. Dropping that number to 30% virtually guaranties that legal lines cannot be drawn, as nearly every county would be subject to a requirement of intactness. Further, we cannot assume future population shifts will not continue to grow Geauga and Portage Counties. The census after next one might very well cause every county (but Ashtabula in the corner) to be kept intact in a single congressional district. With the biggest counties of northeast Ohio on the edges (Cuyahoga, Summit and Mahoning) blocking the bleedover of excess population, it would take a miracle for the population numbers to permit legal line drawing in Northeast Ohio.

Even without these two new proposals, the current proposal contains provisions that do not work.

Here are two examples: First, as mentioned above, there is a new requirement that a county that has a 50% or greater ratio of representation to be kept intact. This will make line drawing in Northeast Ohio very difficult, and in the future could also affect other parts of the state. This was not part of the Senate proposal and was included only in the Clyde-Curtin proposal. I do not

believe this can withstand scrutiny, especially if exacerbated by the alarming second Clyde amendment.

Second, new 4D1c refers to treating as separate cities all split multi county cities only where there they are in a county greater than one full ratio of representation. But as we just noted, the proposal requires you to keep intact not only those counties above 100% but those between 50% and 100%. If two counties are at 60% each, they cannot be combined into the same district (because the population would greatly exceed 100%) and must be put into two separate districts--and must be kept intact in those two separate districts. Yet the rule proposed in 4D1c would not excuse splitting the multicounty city because the counties were between 50% and 100% and not over 100%.

These are only two examples. They can be fixed with a little time and some good faith discussion.

Summary

Fred, I do not believe this proposal is ready to be approved. There are some very complex detailed rules proposed here that have never been the subject of negotiation by people who have experience drawing lines or have thought through how this will work in practice. And, as I don't need to remind you, we are writing rules that would go into the constitution and thus would be very difficult to change if not done right.

HJR 12 was subject to nearly an entire month of negotiations starting with concepts and then quickly getting to specific details, first between House Republican and Democrat negotiators, then between the Senate Republican negotiators and the House negotiators, then between the joint working group and the four leaders. In between negotiations, all parties had discussions with experts to vet each of the provisions.

We looked at the principles and how the rules would work in practice, and how to handle their violations. The details changed many times as we discovered undetected or unanticipated problems and had to adjust the wording to ensure that we got it right. Unfortunately, there are some problematic additions here that have not undergone any such scrutiny.

I am concerned that if it comes up for a vote and passes the committee, even if stopped and fixed in the full commission--but especially if the fixes are resisted--it becomes a very flawed product upon which some enterprising group could build a ballot initiative and the fact that the details are wrong will not matter one whit to voters.

I urge you to hold this proposal for an additional meeting. I would pledge to work with all interested parties to make sure the proposal is fair, workable, and can be something that all sides can support. As currently drafted, that is not the case. Inclusion of the county intactness provision for 50% and up counties does not strike a fair balance between urban counties and the rest of the state. Lowering that number to 30% would make the work of the apportionment board virtually impossible as well as providing a completely lopsided map, with rural areas unable to be combined into mostly rural districts but required to be used as ballast to fill up districts dominated by urban counties.

In addition, we need to go through this proposal with the interested parties to remove unnecessary, "gotcha" detail rules that will make even fair and good faith efforts likely to fail. We need to agree on a set of necessary rules that can be followed without mandating unfair or biased results, and avoid those that are overly prescriptive and those for which any public policy value is outweighed by the difficulty it would add in drawing a legal map.

Both of those can be accomplished, but not before the meeting Thursday. Passing this in your committee on Thursday makes it less likely that the errors will be corrected willingly and more likely that this flawed proposal will stall in the full commission and will then become some group's ballot initiative.

That said, if the committee wants to vote on the top line rules for the operation and composition of the commission and the timeline etc, and put off taking any action on the standards provisions until your next meeting, that would give us ample time to work through them and to bring forward an fair and workable proposal on it.

Thank you for considering my concerns. I am happy for you to distribute this email to all members of the committee. I am concerned enough about the flaws in the current draft that if we don't connect before the end of day tomorrow, I may distribute this myself since I unfortunately cannot be present on Thursday, though I will be here for the following week's meeting of the full commission.

Jeff Jacobson

Legislative Branch and Executive Branch Committee

Planning Worksheet (Through January 2016 Meetings)

Article II - Legislative

Sec. 2 – Election and term of state legislators (1967, am. 1992)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved
Completed	3.12.15	4.9.15	4.9.15	1.14.16			

Sec. 3 – Residence requirements for state legislators (1851, am. 1967)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 4 – Dual office and conflict of interest prohibited (1851, am. 1973)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 5 – Who shall not hold office (1851)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 6 – Powers of each house (1851, am. 1973)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 7 – Organization of each house of the General Assembly (1851, am. 1973)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 8 – Sessions of the General Assembly (1973)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 9 – House and Senate Journals (yeas and nays) (1851, am. 1973)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 10 – Rights of members to protest (1851)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 11 – Filling vacancy in House or Senate (1851, am. 1961, 1968, 1973)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 12 – Privilege of members from arrest, and of speech (1851)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 13 – Legislative sessions to be public; exceptions (1851)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 14 – Power of adjournment (1851, am. 1973)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 15 – How bill shall be passed (1973)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 16 – Bills to be signed by governor; veto (1851, am. 1903, 1912, 1973)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 20 – Term of office, and compensation of officers in certain cases (1851)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 21 – Contested elections (1851)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 22 – Appropriations (1851)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 23 – Impeachments; how instituted and conducted (1851)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 24 – Officers liable to impeachment; consequences (1851)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 26 – Laws to have a uniform operation (1851)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 27 – Election and appointment of officers; filling vacancies (1851, am. 1953)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 28 – Retroactive laws (1851)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 29 – No extra compensation; exceptions (1851)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 30 – New counties (1851)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 31 – Compensation of members and officers of the General Assembly (1851)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 32 – Divorces and judicial power (1851)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 33 – Mechanics' and contractors' liens (1912)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 34 – Welfare of employees (1912)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 34a – Minimum Wage (2006)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 35 – Workers' compensation (1912, am. 1923)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 36 – Conservation of natural resources (1912, am. 1973)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 37 – Workday and workweek on public projects (1912)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 38 – Removal of officials for misconduct (1912)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 39 – Regulating expert testimony in criminal trials (1912)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 40 – Registering and warranting land titles (1912)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 41 – Prison labor (1912, am. 1978)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 42 – Continuity of government operations in emergencies caused by enemy attack (1961)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Article III - Executive**Sec. 1 – Executive department; key state officers (1851, am. 1885)**

Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 1a – Joint vote cast for governor and lieutenant (1976)

Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 1b – Lieutenant governor duties assigned by governor (1976)

Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 2 – Term of office of key state officers (1851, am. 1954, 1992)

Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 3 – Counting votes for key state officers (1851, am. 1976)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 5 – Executive power vested in governor (1851)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 6 – Governor to see that laws executed; may require written information (1851)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 7 – Governor’s annual message to General Assembly; recommendations for legislators (1851)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 8 – Governor may convene special session of legislature with limited purposes (1851, am. 1912)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 9 – When Governor may adjourn the legislature (1851)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 10 – Governor is commander-in-chief of militia (1851)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 11 – Governor may grant reprieves, commutations and pardons (1851, am. 1995)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 12 – Seal of the state, and by whom kept (1851)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 13 – How grants and commissions issued (1851)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 14 – Who is ineligible for governor (1851)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 15 – Succession in case of vacancy in office of governor (1976)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 17 – If a vacancy shall occur while executing the office of governor, who shall act (1976)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 17a – Filling a vacancy in the office of lieutenant governor (1989)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 18 – Governor to fill vacancies in key state offices (1851, am. 1969)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 19 – Compensation of key state officers (1851)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 20 – Annual report of executive officers (1851)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 21 – Appointments to office; advice and consent of Senate (1961)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 22 – Supreme Court to determine disability of governor or governor elect; succession (1976)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Article V – Elective Franchise (Select Provision)

Sec. 8 – Term limits for U.S. senators and representatives (1992)

Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 9 – Eligibility of office holders (1992)

Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Article IX - Militia

Sec. 1 – Who shall perform military duty (1851, am. 1953, 1961)

Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 3 – Appointment of militia officers (1851, am. 1961)

Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 4 – Power of governor to call forth militia (1851, am. 1961)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 5 – Public arms; arsenals (1851)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Article XI – Apportionment/Congressional Redistricting

Sec. 1 – Ohio Redistricting Commission (2015/2021)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 2 – Representative for each house and senate district (2015/2021)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 3 – Ratio of representation in house and senate (2015/2021)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 4 – Formation of senate districts (2015/2021)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 5 – Term of senators on change of senate district boundaries (2015/2021)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 6 – General assembly districts; standards for drawing (2015/2021)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 7 – General assembly districts; change at end of decennial period (2015/2021)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 8 – Adoption of final plan; failure to adopt (2015/2021)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 9 – Supreme Court jurisdiction (2015/2021)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 10 – Severability of provisions (2015/2021)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Article XIV - Ohio Livestock Care Standards Board (2009)

Sec. 1 – Ohio Livestock Care Standards Board (2009)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

This page intentionally left blank.

This page intentionally left blank.



OHIO CONSTITUTIONAL MODERNIZATION COMMISSION

2016 Meeting Dates

March 10

April 14

May 12

June 9

July 14

August 11

September 8

October 13

November 10

December 8