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## Passing a Plan—Is A Simple Majority Enough, Or Is More Required?

## Requirements to Pass a Legislative Redistricting Bill

| Category | States |
| :--- | :--- |
| Commission Draws Maps; Needs Simple <br> Majority* | 12 states: AK, AZ, AR, CO, HI, ID, MT, NJ, NY, OH, <br> PA, WA |
| Commission Draws Maps; Needs More <br> Than Simple Majority | 2 states: CA, MO |
| Legislature Draws Maps; Needs Simple <br> Majority | 33 states (all not otherwise listed) |
| Legislature Draws Maps; Needs More Than <br> Simple Mmajority | 2 states: CT, ME |
| Governor's maps are submitted to <br> legislature, which can override with a <br> resolution within 45 days, otherwise <br> governor's map becomes law). | 1 state: MD |

*Simple majority is defined as the smallest possible majority, excluding rules regarding ties.

## Requirements to Pass a Congressional Redistricting Bill

| Category | States |
| :--- | :--- |
| Commission Simple Majority | 7 states: AZ, HI, ID, MT, NJ, NY, WA |
| Commission Supermajority | 1 state: CA |
| Legislative Simple Majority | 34 states (all not otherwise listed) |
| Legislative Supermajority | 2 states: CT, ME |
| One seat only in U.S. House* | 7 states: AK, DE, MT, ND, SD, VT, WY |

*Montana is both an at-large seat and has a commission to redraw its congressional districts. It is counted twice.

## States Without A Gubernatorial Veto for Redistricting Plans

In most states where the legislature draws maps, a bill is the vehicle, and is subject to a veto. The exceptions to that rule are:

Florida:
Legislative plans passed as a joint resolution, not a statute, and are thus not subject to a veto. Congressional plans are subject to governor's action.

Mississippi:
Legislative plans passed as a joint resolution, not a statute, and are thus not subject to a gov. veto. Congressional plans are subject to governor's action.

North Carolina:
All districts passed by ordinary statute rules, but are exempted from gubernatorial veto.

## Commissions

In 13 states, a commission has primary responsibility for drawing legislative maps. In 7 of those states, the commission also has responsibility for drawing Congressional maps.

These commissions are described below, with their size, who appoints, special selection requirements, and how the commission was created.

Note that another set of states have advisory commissions (which provide input to the legislature, which has final responsibility) or back-up commissions which come into effect if the legislature us unable to create a plan. For more on these commissions, see:

NCSL's webpage, Redistricting Commissions: Legislative Plans
http://www.ncsl.org/research/redistricting/2009-redistricting-commissions-table.aspx
NCSL's webpage, Redistricting Commissions: Congressional Plans
http://www.ncsl.org/research/redistricting/redistricting-commissions-congressional-plans.aspx

## Legislative Commissions

| State | Members | Appointing Authority | Selection Process | Origins |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Alaska | 5 | Gov. chooses two, Senate <br> \& House Majority <br> Leaders each choose 1; <br> Chief Justice of State <br> Supreme Court chooses 1 | No commissioners <br> may be public officials <br> or employees upon <br> appointment. | Legislative <br> Referral <br> $(1998)$ |
| Arizona | 5 | State commission on <br> appellate court <br> appointments nominates a <br> pool of 25 potential <br> commissioners—10 Ds, <br> 10 Rs, 10 Is. From this <br>  <br> Minority leader in each <br> house select 1 member. <br> Those 4 select 5t to be <br> chair \& tiebreaker, and <br> that 5th can't be of same <br> partisan affiliation as any <br> other commissioner. | Each commissioner <br> must be registered to <br> vote in Arizona, and <br> must have maintained <br> the same political <br> party affiliation (or <br> lack thereof) for three <br> years. At most, two of <br> first four <br> commissioners may <br> live in same county. | Citizens' <br> Initiative <br> $(2000)$ |
| Arkansas | 3 | Gov. Sec. of State, AG | N/A |  |


| California | 14 | Panel of 3 state auditors chooses 20 Democrats, 20 Republicans, and 20 who are neither to be nominees for the commission. Panel should consider analytical skills, impartiality, and diversity when selecting the pool of nominees. <br> From this pool, 2 nominees may be cut by Majority \& Minority leader in each house. Eight commissioners (3D, 3R, 2 neither) are chosen randomly from the remaining nominees. Those eight choose 6 colleagues from the remaining nominees, to reflect the diversity of the state. | Commissioners must have voted in at least two of the statewide elections, and may not have changed party affiliation for at least five years. Cannot have been, or had a family member that has been, within 10 years of appointment, a candidate for federal or state office or a member of a party central committee, or a paid consultant to any of the above. Cannot have been a registered lobbyist or paid legislative staff, or have donated more than $\$ 2000$ to an elected candidate. Cannot serve, nor have immediately family serving, in government or as a government contractor during service as commissioner. | Citizens’ <br> Initiative <br> (2008); <br> powers <br> enhanced by <br> Citizens' <br> Initiative <br> (2010) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Colorado | 11 | 1 each by Majority \& Minority leader in each house; 3 by Governor. 4 by Chief Justice of state Supreme Court. | No more than 4 commissioners may be legislators; no more than 6 may have same party registration; no more than 4 may live in same congressional district. At least 1 commissioner must be from each congressional district; of these, 1 member must live west of the continental divide. | Citizens’ <br> Initiative <br> (1974) |


| Hawaii | 9 | 2 each by Majority \& Minority leader in each house; those 8 select $9^{\text {th }}$. If they cannot, Supreme Court appoints tiebreaking member | In the first two elections following the creation of the districts, no commissioner is eligible to run for a seat in either house of the state Legislature, or for a Congressional seat. | Legislative Referral (1992) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Idaho | 6 | 1 each by Majority \& Minority leader in each house; 1 each by chairs of two largest political parties in state | Commissioners cannot be an elected official in Idaho when appointed. Further, those who have been registered lobbyists within the past year, or elected officials or district, county, or state party officers within the last two years, may serve as commissioners. | Legislative Referral (1994) |
| Missouri (House) | 18 | 2 each by each party's congressional district committee for each of the state's congressional districts. 1 per district per party by Governor. | Commissioners are prohibited from serving as members in either house of the General Assembly for four years following date upon which maps are filed. | Legislative Referral (1966) |
| Missouri (Senate) | 13 | Each major party's state party committee nominates 10 members; Governor chooses 5 per party from the nominees to serve on commission. | Commissioners are prohibited from serving as members in either house of the General Assembly for four years following date upon which maps are filed. | Legislative Referral (1966) |


| Montana | 5 | 1 each by Majority \& Minority leader in each house; those 4 select $5^{\text {th }}$ to be Chair. If they cannot agree, Supreme Court selects Chair. | Of first four commissioners, two each must be selected from two distinct geographic county groupings: from the Rocky Mountains westward to the Idaho border, and from the eastern remainder of the state. | Legislative Referral (1984) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New Jersey | 11 | 5 each by Chairs of state's two largest parties. If those 10 cannot agree to a map, state Supreme Court appoints tiebreaking member. | Due consideration in selection of commissioners should be given to geographic diversity of state. | Legislative Referral (1966) |
| Ohio | 5 | Governor, Auditor, Secretary of State. 1 each chosen by Speaker of House and House Minority Leader (each in concert with his or her party's leader in the Senate). | None | Legislative Referral (2015) |
| Pennsylvania | 5 | 1 each by Majority \& Minority leader in each house; those 4 select $5^{\text {th }}$ to serve as Chair. If they cannot agree, Supreme Court selects $5^{\text {th }}$ to serve as Chair. | None | Legislative Referral (1968) (adopted as part of 1968 State Constitution) |
| Washington | 5 | 1 each by Majority \& Minority leader in each house; those 4 select $5^{\text {th }}$. | No commissioner may have been elected official or elected party officer at any level within two years of appointment as commissioner. Persons registered as lobbyists in last year also prohibited from serving as commissioners. | Legislative Referral (1983) |


| State | Members | Appointing Authority | Selection Requirements \& Notes | Origins |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arizona | 5 | State commission on appellate court appointments nominates a pool of 25 potential commissioners- 10 Ds , 10 Rs, 10 Is. From this pool, Majority \& Minority leader in each house select 1 member. Those 4 select $5^{\text {th }}$ to be chair \& tiebreaker, and that $5^{\text {th }}$ can't be of same partisan affiliation as any other commissioner. | Each commissioner must be registered to vote in Arizona, and must have maintained the same political party affiliation (or lack thereof) for three years. At most, two of first four commissioners may live in same county. | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Citizens’ } \\ & \text { Initiative } \\ & (2000) \end{aligned}$ |
| California | 14 | Panel of 3 state auditors chooses 20 Democrats, 20 Republicans, and 20 who are neither to be nominees for the commission. Panel should consider analytical skills, impartiality, and diversity when selecting the pool of nominees. <br> From this pool, 2 nominees may be cut by Majority \& Minority leader in each house. Eight commissioners (3D, 3R, 2 neither) are chosen randomly from the remaining nominees. Those eight choose 6 colleagues from the remaining nominees, to reflect the diversity of the state. | Commissioners may not have changed party affiliation for at least five years. Cannot have been, or had a family member that has been, within 10 years of appointment, a candidate for federal or state office or a member of a party central committee, or a paid consultant to any of the above. Cannot have been a registered lobbyist, or have donated more than $\$ 2000$ to an elected candidate. Cannot serve in government or as a government contractor during service as commissioner. | Citizens’ Initiative (2008); powers enhanced by Citizens' Initiative (2010) |


| Hawaii | 9 | 2 each by Majority \& Minority leader in each house; those 8 select $9^{\text {th }}$. If they cannot, Supreme Court appoints tiebreaking member | In the first two elections following the creation of the districts, no commissioner is eligible to run for a seat in either house of the state Legislature, or for a Congressional seat. | Legislative Referral (1992) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Idaho | 6 | 1 each by Majority \& Minority leader in each house; 1 each by chairs of two largest political parties in state | Commissioners cannot be an elected official in Idaho when appointed. Further, those who have been registered lobbyists within the past year, or elected officials or district, county, or state party officers within the last two years, may serve as commissioners. | Legislative <br> Referral (1994) |
| Montana | 5 | 1 each by Majority \& Minority leader in each house; those 4 select $5^{\text {th }}$ to be Chair. If they cannot agree, Supreme Court selects Chair. | Of first four commissioners, two each must be selected from two distinct geographic county groupings: from the Rocky Mountains westward to the Idaho border, and from the eastern remainder of the state. | Legislative <br> Referral (1984) |
| New Jersey | 13 | 2 each by Majority \& Minority leader in each house; 2 each by chairs of two largest political parties. Those 12 select $13^{\text {th }}$ to be Chair. If they cannot agree, they present two candidates to the Supreme Court, who then chooses the Chair. | Members should be appointed with consideration to ethnic, racial, and geographic diversity. | Legislative <br> Referral (1966) |


| Washington | 5 |  <br> Minority leader in each <br> house; those 4 select 5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Criteria (Traditional Districting Principles and Emerging Criteria)

The tables below summarize state-specific redistricting principles and criteria in use in two or more sates. The information is divided into criteria applicable for legislative plans and criteria applicable to Congressional plans. For more, see NCSL's webpage, Redistricting Criteria, http://www.ncsl.org/research/redistricting/redistricting-criteria.aspx

Criteria Applicable to Legislative Plans

| Criterion | Number of States Adopted | States |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Compactness | 39 | AL, AK, AZ, AR, CA, CO, FL, GA, HI, ID, IL, IA, KS, ME, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NE, NV, NJ, NM, NY, ND, OH, OK, PA, RI, SC, SD, UT, VT, VA, WA, WV, WI, WY |
| Contiguity | 50 | AL, AK, AZ, AR, CA, CO, CT, DE, FL, GA, HI, ID, IL, IN, IA, KS, KY, LA, ME, MD, MA, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NE, NV, NH, NJ, NM, NY, NC, ND, OH, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, SD, TN, UT, VT, VA, WA,WV, WI, WY |
| Preserving Political Subdivisions | 43 | AL, AK, AZ, AR, CA, CO, CT, FL, GA, ID, IA, KS, KY, LA, ME, MD, MA, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NE, NV, NH, NJ, NM, NY, NC, ND, OH, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, SD, TN, VT, WA, WV, WI, WY |
| Preserving Communities of Interest | 26 | AL, AK, AZ, AR, CA, CO, GA, HI, ID, KS, MI, MN, MS, NV, NM, NY, NC, OK, OR, PA, SC, SD, VT, VA, WA, WY |
| Avoid Pairing Incumbents | 3 | KS, NV, SC |


| Preserve Cores of Prior <br> Districts | 8 | AR, LA, MI, NE, NV, NY, ND, SC |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Enhance Competition | 3 | AZ, NY, WA |
| Cannot Favor or Disfavor <br> Any Political <br> Party/Incumbent/Candidate | 12 | AZ, CA, DE, FL, HI, IA, MN, MT, NE, NY, <br> OH, WA |
| Cannot Use Partisan Data | 5 | AZ, CA, IA, MT, NE |

## Criteria Applicable to Congressional plans

| Criterion | Number of <br> States <br> Adopted | States |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Compactness | 27 | AL, AZ, CA, FL, GA, HI, ID, IA, ME, MI, <br> MN, MS, MO, NE, NV, NJ, NM, NY, ND, OK, <br> PA, RI, SC, UT, VA, WA, WV, WY |
| Contiguity | 33 | AL, AZ, CA, FL, GA, HI, ID, IA, KS, KY, LA, <br> ME, MA, MI, MN, MO, NE, NV, NJ, NM, NY, <br> NC, ND, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, UT, VA, <br> WA, WV, WY |
| Preserving Political <br> Subdivisions | 29 | AL, AZ, CA, FL, GA, ID, IA, KS, KY, LA, <br> ME, MA, MI, MN, NE, NV, NJ, NM, NY, NC, <br> ND, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, WA, WV, WY |
| Preserving Communities of <br> Interest | 21 | AL, AZ, AR, CA, GA, HI, ID, KS, KY, MN, <br> MS, NV, NM, NY, OK, OR, PA, SC, VA, WA, <br> WY |
| Avoid Pairing Incumbents | 2 | NV, SC |
| Preserve Cores of Prior <br> Districts | 7 | LA, KS, NE, NV, NY, ND, SC |
| Enhance Competition | 3 | AZ, NY, WA |
| Cannot Favor or Disfavor <br> Any Political <br> Party/Incumbent/Candidate | 8 | AZ, CA, FL, HI, IA, NY, OH, WA |
| Cannot Use Partisan Data | 5 | AZ, CA, IA, MT, NE |

## What Happens if a Bill Doesn't Pass?

Most states are silent on what action is taken, or who will draw districts, if a state misses the deadline for redistricting. Of the states that do specify a back-up plan, the options are a back-up commission is called on, or the state Supreme Court is assigned the task, or, in three states, another option is identified.

Legislative Maps

| What Happens | States |
| :--- | :--- |
| Back-up commission draws maps | CT, IL, MS, OK, TX |
| State Supreme Court draws maps | FL, ME, WA |
| State Supreme Court appoints commission of state <br> appellate judges | MO |
| Governor's plan takes effect | MD |
| Secretary of state draws maps | OR |
| No Statutory or Constitutional Procedure | 39 states (all otherwise <br> not specified) |

Congressional Maps

| What Happens | States |
| :--- | :--- |
| Backup Commission Draws Maps | CT, IN |
| State Supreme Court Draws Maps | ME, WA |
| No Statutory or Constitutional Procedure | 46 states (all others not <br> specified) |
| Other | N/A |

## Additional Resources

NCSL's webpage, Redistricting Commissions: Legislative Plans
http://www.ncsl.org/research/redistricting/2009-redistricting-commissions-table.aspx
NCSL's webpage, Redistricting Commissions: Congressional Plans
http://www.ncsl.org/research/redistricting/redistricting-commissions-congressional-plans.aspx
NCSL's webpage, Action on Redistricting Plans, which leads to decade-by-decade analysis of passage of plans http://www.ncsl.org/research/redistricting/redistricting-plan-success-rates636359876.aspx?ct=8f67d1103a2ee8d19398053f2ddb964eb0c3bce969ba53a23056fd1da9619c0 309f3e8425022b053bc574f51b9cd2e5cbb37269367e86e95eb57c2862c76e66d

NCSL's webpage, Redistricting Plan Success Rates, which compares legislative and commission plans in how well they fared under court challenges
http://www.ncsl.org/Portals/1/Documents/Elections/new_success_rates_1970s-2010s_31520.pdf
NCSL's webpage, The "Iowa Model" for Redistricting
http://www.ncsl.org/research/redistricting/the-iowa-model-for-redistricting.aspx
NCSL's webpage, Redistricting and the Supreme Court: The Most Significant Cases
http://www.ncsl.org/research/redistricting/redistricting-and-the-supreme-court-the-most-
significant-cases.aspx
NCSL's webpage, Redistricting Case Summaries | 2010-Present
http://www.ncsl.org/research/redistricting/redistricting-case-summaries-2010-present.aspx
Constitutional language for Ohio's legislative redistricting commission, passed in 2015 https://www.legislature.ohio.gov/laws/ohioconstitution/section;jsessionid=7e9cf24cd5310c9d3f2ae62e845e?const=11.01*

Ohio Secretary of State Jon Husted's video explanation on Ohio's Congressional redistricting proposal (Issue 1), to be voted on during May's primary election https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=V8mXfAZXobE

