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Introduction

- Who wants guidelines?
- Disadvantages?
- Advantages?
- Who has used what guidelines before?
- How do they work?

Who Wants Guidelines?

- People not drawing plans
  - Outsiders
  - The minority
  - Majority rank and file
- People drawing plans who need another’s approval to adopt them
  - Other members
  - The other body
  - The governor
  - A court

Disadvantages

- They tie your hands
- If you don’t follow them, you look bad
  - Politically embarrassing
  - May provoke legal attack

Advantages

- Make drafters aware of legal limits
- Narrow range of disputes
- Help survive legal challenges
- Help tell when you’ve gotten to “yes”

Past Guidelines

- Limits on Gerrymanders
- Districting Principles for 2000s Plans
- Procedural Guidelines
Limits on Gerrymanders

- Who draws the plans
- Data that may be used
- Review by others
- Districts that result

Limits on Data

- No party registration
  - Iowa, Montana, Nebraska
- No election results
  - Iowa, Montana, Nebraska
- No socio-economic data
  - Iowa, Nebraska
- No incumbent residences
  - Arizona, California, Iowa, Montana, Wyoming

Limits on Procedures

- Public hearings
  - Commission states
  - Iowa
- Preliminary plan
  - Commission states
  - Iowa
- Judicial review
  - Colorado
  - Florida
  - Kansas

Limits on Districts that Result

Table 8 - Districting Principles for 2000s Plans

- Populations equal
- Territory compact - 36 states
- Territory contiguous - 48 states
- Political subdivisions preserved - 44
- Communities of interest preserved - 21

How Do Guidelines Work?

Minnesota Example

- Districting Principles for the Plans
- Reports on Whether Guidelines Followed
- Procedural Guidelines for Submitting Plans

Limits on Districts that Result

Table 8 - Districting Principles for 2000s Plans

- Cores of prior districts preserved - 13
- Incumbents protected - 20 states
- Minorities fairly represented - 27 states
- Politically competitive - 2 states
- House districts nested in Senate - 17
Districting Principles
SF 182 (2009)

- Number of districts
  - Set by statute
- Nesting
  - Minn. Const. Art. 4, § 3
  - Plan Comparison Report
- Population equality
  - Legislative - 2% deviation
  - Congressional - no deviation
  - Population Summary Report

Districting Principles, cont’d
SF 182 (2009)

- Contiguity, compactness
  - Convenient contiguous territory - Minn. Const. Art. 4 § 3
  - Structured into compact units
  - Contiguity by water sufficient
  - Point contiguity not permitted, unless within same municipality
  - Compactness Report
  - Contiguity Report

Districting Principles, cont’d
SF 182 (2009)

- Numbering
  - A regular series - Minn. Const. Art. 4, § 3
- Minority representation
  - Not dilute voting strength - VRA § 2
  - Increase probability minorities elected
  - Minority Report - Voting Age Population

Districting Principles, cont’d
SF 182 (2009)

- Preserving political subdivisions
  - Counties, cities, towns
  - As few districts as possible
  - Political Subdivision Splits Report
- Communities of interest
  - Social, political, cultural, ethnic, or economic
  - Linked by transportation or communication
  - Communities of Interest Report
Districting Principles, cont’d
SF 182 (2009)

- Political competitiveness
  - Partisan index
  - Difference between Democrat and Republican index no more than 8%
  - Competitiveness Report
- Incumbents
  - Not drawn either to protect or defeat
  - Incumbents Report

Procedural Guidelines
SF 1326 (2001)

- Public hearings
  - No requirements
- Preliminary plan
  - No requirements
- Judicial review
  - No requirements

Districting Principles on Web
2000s Plans

- Map of the 50 States with link to each
  - Table of the 50 States
  - Text of each State’s principles
  - Searchable
  - [http://geo.commissions.leg.state.mn.us/RedPrinc2010/](http://geo.commissions.leg.state.mn.us/RedPrinc2010/)
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