

Fair Redistricting in the 2000's

A Manual for Minority Groups

William C. Velasquez Institute

National Office

403 E. Commerce, Ste. 260

San Antonio, TX 78205

(210) 222-8014

(877) 535-8508

Preface

As our decade begins, elected representatives of each level of government will evaluate the changes in population that have taken place over the past ten years and redraw the lines of the political districts from which they were elected.

The redistricting process is arguably the most important political event of the decade. Decisions on where to draw the lines set the political geography within which electorate contests will be waged in the next ten years.

Standards have been set over the years by framers of the federal and state constitutions, by law makers and the courts. Redistricting must be done in accordance with the principle of one person/one vote or equal populations and in a manner which does not dilute the voting strength of any racial or language minority. But given the survival instincts of incumbents, only through active participation of minority citizens in the redistricting process can minority communities be assured the process is conducted in a manner which fairly represents their interests.

Who are better suited to determine what type of district best represents the interests of minorities than minority voters themselves? This manual is written to provide a guide for minorities to participate in an informed way in the redistricting process.

In 1989 the Population Reference Bureau published *Redistricting in the 1990s: A Guide for Minority Groups*. That publication was designed as an overview of the 1990 redistricting process, to help minority groups begin planning for effective participation. The purpose of the current manual is to examine the redistricting process more closely and to expand on the more practical and technical aspects of redistricting so that minority groups can develop a working knowledge of the techniques and tools of redistricting. The publication is prepared in a style and format that can be useful throughout the nation by a

variety of minority groups: African Americans, Asians, Hispanics and Native Americans. The manual was conceived out of a need for some practical guidelines for training minority group leaders on how to become involved in the redistricting process.

It is the product of the common need effort of several organizations interested in effecting minority citizen input into redistricting: the William C. Velasquez Institute (WCVI), the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF), the National Association of Latino Elected Officials (NALEO), and the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC).

Chapter 1

Redistricting in the 2000s

The 2000 Census of population marks a year of census taking and analysis, the chief purpose of which is to ensure that members of the U.S. House of Representatives are apportioned among the states in a manner which reflects the relative size of the each states population. This reapportionment process is accomplished by a mathematical calculation called the method of equal proportions. The numbers required for apportionment are delivered to the president by the Census Bureau before December 31, 2000, as required by law.

What follows during the next two years is redistricting—the redrawing of congressional and legislative district boundaries within each state. Although it is population change that makes the redistricting process necessary, redistricting is not simply a mechanical process by which optimum districts are drawn to satisfy a set of legal criteria. Redistricting is important to the balance of power and future governance in an area and, as such, it takes place in a political context in which decisions are made on the basis of competing group interests.

Redistricting is thus both a political and a technical process; it is debated in the legislative arena and drafted on computer-generated maps. To influence the redistricting process requires the application of both political and technical skills. If those who are outside the legislative bodies wish to influence redistricting, they must prepare to enter the system by developing the technical and organizational training needed for the task.

Population Changes in the 1990s
(used as example until 2000 data is released)

The population changes during the decade of the 1980s make the stakes all the higher for minorities in the reapportionment-redistricting process this time. Nine-tenths of the nations growth during the past decade took place in the West and the South, where most minorities reside. More than

half of the 22.2 million national population increase occurred in California (6.1 million), Florida (3.2 million) and Texas (2.8 million), states with particularly large concentrations of Hispanics and Asians.

Asian-Americans increased most rapidly, doubling their numbers during the 1990s. Hispanics increased by 53 percent and Blacks by 13 percent. Hispanics alone account for more than one-third of the total population growth from 1980 to 1990; Blacks and Asians together comprise another third of the nation's growth during the 1980s. The growth of minority groups will be in truth even greater than shown in the official census figures. Dependent on which figures are used in the reapportionment process, adjusted or unadjusted, minorities could show even larger gains.

Translated into congressional seats, these population changes mean that minorities are in a position to make some gains in representation in the 108th Congress. The rapid population growth among minorities will most assuredly have a profound effect on the redistricting of state legislatures and local jurisdictions. Elected officials will draft plans for new district boundaries prior to their respective elections in 1992 and 1993.

Representative democracy depends on citizen participation in the electoral process for its strength and legitimacy. If a growing segment of the population is left out of the political process, democracy is weakened and in jeopardy. History is replete with devices which limit the influence of minorities in the political process: literacy tests for voting, the poll tax, restrictive voter registration rules, purge laws, the at-large election system, majority run-off requirements and racial gerrymandering.

Through litigation attacking the structural barriers to full political participation, the integration of racial and language minorities into the political process has improved over the past 25 years. In the 80's, hundreds of new political districts were created as a result of litigation which challenged at-large systems of elections in cities, counties and school districts. A 1989 study of changes from at-large to district elections in Texas cities and school districts found that

minority representation more than doubled after the at-large system was abandoned and district elections were implemented.

Minority Representation In the 1980s

Greater minority representation has accompanied the growth of minorities in the population, although it lags considerably behind what one might expect from the percent each minority comprises of the total population. The growth of minority populations, improvements in census data and technology, and new judicial ruling on voting rights law provide an opportunity during the current redistricting process for minorities to consolidate and improve upon the gains of the 1980s. Redistricting also provides an opportunity to improve governments understanding of minority interests and concerns, so crucial to maintaining government's legitimacy in a changing demographic environment.

A Plan to Influence Redistricting in the 2000s

The redistricting process is guarded carefully by incumbents concerned with political survival. To intervene effectively in that legislative process requires a comprehensive plan. If the minority community is to have effective input on how districts are drawn, it will need to develop a work plan in three spheres of activity: community education, research and litigation.

Community Education. To educate local minority leaders on the procedures for developing a redistricting plan, a series of organizational meetings should be planned toward the end of forming a coalition of local groups with similar interests in redistricting. Minority leaders may form a local committee on redistricting and be trained in the tools and procedures for drafting redistricting plans. The local committee will monitor the redistricting process in its community and provide insights about the types of state legislative and congressional plans which would work in the best interests of minorities in its area.

Research. To operate effectively, local redistricting committee members will need the data and technical assistance to develop a plan for their area. At the minimum, two tools are

needed in order to draw districts: census maps and census data. Since both census data and maps are now available in machine-readable form, redistricting can be accomplished on a computer with the proper software and hardware. Additionally, in 2000, community groups will have the new option of internet redistricting for local level efforts. Registration and election data may be added to improve the analysis of whether a proposed plan can produce a district which is able to be won by minority candidates.

Litigation. Where minorities are not able to influence the legislative deliberations on redistricting and a plan is adopted which dilutes minority voting strength, law suits may be filed or comments written to the Voting Rights section of the Department of Justice. Although litigation is seen as the course of last resort, each local plan should be prepared with the foresight required to go into court. Previous litigation has resulted in several standards for drawing fair redistricting plans. The one-person, one-vote standard has been articulated through at least 25 years of litigation. For those jurisdictions covered by Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, preclearance of any change is required and minority input into the process is welcome. For every jurisdiction, the Congress and the courts have set standards for avoiding minority vote dilution under Section 2, which covers both racial and language minorities.

While community education, research and litigation are described as three separate spheres of activity, in practice there is a good deal of overlap among the three areas. Minority groups who participate in the redistricting process will find themselves involved, to a greater or lesser extent, in all three activities. Furthermore, the activities are interdependent, each requiring some exchange of information and expertise from the other. Through *community education* efforts, local sites are identified for the research component to provide the data, the technology and the training needed for redistricting. Where community education efforts have tried unsuccessfully to intervene in the legislative process of redistricting, *litigation* may be filed with the intent of opening the electoral process to minorities.

Litigation begins to define the research agenda and the research component, in turn, provides analysis and expert testimony for lawsuits challenging the redistricting plans which dilute minority voting strength.

The overall goal is to ensure that minority interests are represented in the redistricting plan that is finally implemented. This is most effectively accomplished through legislative advocacy. Legislative advocacy will be only as successful as the extent to which advocacy groups are organized and prepared in each sphere of activity.

How to utilize these three spheres of activity in developing a comprehensive redistricting strategy is part of what this manual is all about.

Chapter 2

Getting Organized

As districting plans are being drawn by jurisdictions across the country, it is essential that the minority communities be prepared to develop and present plans, organized to have input into the decision-making process of the jurisdictions developing redistricting plans and mobilized to influence the process. Finally, the minority community must be prepared to object to those plans that fail short of being fair and equitable.

There are two aspects of advocacy work on behalf of the minority community in the redistricting process. The first is education of the minority community and minority leaders as to the impact of redistricting on their goals and aspirations. Second, and perhaps more importantly, leaders, organizations and concerned citizens must promote a unified action plan to persuade elected officials to draw redistricting plans that do not diminish or minimize minority voting strength.

To accomplish these objectives, local minority communities must be organized and capable of mobilizing organizations, leaders and the community at large to influence decision makers.

Organizing a Fair Redistricting Committee

The stakes in redistricting and the widespread recognition of political empowerment as a critical issue makes building a coalition around a fair redistricting process one of the great unifying opportunities in the minority community. Minority leaders, organizations and the public at large recognize political power as the key to improving the lives of any group. Mobilizing political strength by registering people to vote, getting them to the polls and making sure that opportunities exist for minority persons to elect candidates of their own choosing are issues that unite all segments of the minority community. How to harness the commitment to political empowerment and unearth the unity that already exists is the key to organization. This inherent unity must not only be shown, but also employed to accomplish the objectives of fair redistricting.

Formation of a Fair Redistricting Committee (hereafter, the committee) in each county or city that is a broad-based coalition of minority leaders, organizations and concerned citizens is a beginning.

The more leaders, organizations and members of the public the committee represents, the greater the clout of the committee and the community resources available to the committee. Furthermore, a unified minority community is more difficult for others to splinter or deny.

A first step in building a redistricting coalition is the contact of all the minority civic organizations, minority leaders and community activists. The initial contact may be used to explain committee or coalition objectives, invite participation in the initial organization and set a first meeting.

The Work of the Committee or Coalition

Goals of the coalition or committee for fair redistricting would be the following:

1. Prepare a calendar for the redistricting process at the local level (i.e. county, city council and school districts) and for all committee or coalition activities and deadlines.
2. Begin education of the minority community organizations on the redistricting process and what is at stake through the minority-group media, presentations and organizational newsletters.
3. Advocate the importance of fairness in redistricting before the non-minority community.
4. The drawing of districting plans that maximize minority representation. (the assistance of minority voting rights advocacy groups where necessary)
5. Organize and mobilize mass-based community support for district plans that meet the test of fairness through newsletters, community meetings, etc.

6. Monitor the redistricting processes:

a) Review and analyze plans developed by the local jurisdictions and others.

b) Provide testimony and community comment on plans and processes at public hearings.

7. Meet with key decision makers to advocate for fair and equitable districts.

8. Where applicable, prepare comments on plans to U.S. Department of Justice under preclearance provision of the Voting Rights Act.

9. Begin preparation for litigation.

In order to accomplish all this work, it probably makes some sense to break up into subcommittees, work areas or task forces. Some of the more obvious are:

Strategy: Prepares calendars, identifies key pressure points and advocates for fair redistricting.

Research: Develops the district plans.

Litigation: Prepares for a possible lawsuit.

Education: Utilizes the media to educate community on redistricting.

The representatives of each of these work areas can serve as an informal executive committee or planning council.

In any structure, a situation that encourages leaders or groups to struggle for control of the committee would ultimately be harmful to the work of the committee. If that means no chairpersons or spokespersons, then so be it. Hopefully enough trust and consensus will exist within the coalition so as to have a neutral chairperson or spokesperson. This is essential if the committee and the minority community is to present a united voice on redistricting.

First Step

The first step is to set the date and location of the committee meeting. To prepare for the meeting, the committee should identify all key leaders who will have an interest in redistricting—elected, non-elected, Republicans, Democrats, civic organizations, activist organizations, etc. Personally invite the identified leaders to the meeting and explain the importance of their attending. Next, after designating a committee member to contact other leaders, work to accomplish these important tasks at the organizing meeting:

a. Brief leaders on the coalition and the strategy for line drawing and advocacy.

b. Take a vote to form a city/county redistricting committee.

c. Form working committees in the areas of strategy, research, litigation and education, with each committee electing a coordinator.

d. Make work assignments to the strategy committee: Begin to gather information on the process, procedure and time line for county redistricting and

As the redistricting process takes shape in the jurisdiction, the Fair Redistricting Committee should aggressively inquire about that process. There are several key questions that should be asked.

a. Will the governing board be appointing a committee on redistricting?

1. If yes, how can a person get on? Who will be on it? How many persons will be on it? Where will they meet? Will they be receiving alternative plans? 2. If no, why won't they? Will the governing board be assigning the task to staff? Can the committee have access to staff?

b. What will the time lines be for the process? Is it in writing?

c. Will there be public hearings? Ideally, hearings would be held:

After preliminary plans have been drawn to

evaluate those plans and advocate for any changes.

After final lines have been developed, but before they have been voted on.

d. Will the public or public interest groups be allowed to present plans and make comments? What will be the schedule of the hearings? Will the hearings be held in the community or only at the governing board offices? What is the procedure for getting on the agenda for these hearings?

e. Will the jurisdiction use adjusted figures?

f. Will the jurisdiction make preliminary plans available with all the supporting documents early enough for evaluation and comment?

9. Other questions to ask:

Will the jurisdiction establish criteria for redistricting? What criteria?

Will the data used by the jurisdiction for redistricting be made available to the public? How? When?

h. All responses to questions should be on the record (in writing or transcripts of public hearings). Additionally, any delays, postponements or reluctance to meet should be documented.

Advocacy Methods

In meetings between the committee and individual officials, there are several general rules which should be followed.

a. Never attend a meeting alone. Always be sure there are four or more attending. Designate:

One person as spokesperson;

One person to take notes or to make notes of the meeting immediately following the meeting;

One person to ask target questions;

One to present data.

b. The Fair Redistricting Committee should be made up of leaders the official knows and respects and/or active persons from his district, persons from his district with the reputation for turning out voters or campaign funds.

C. Meetings have one of two main goals:

To ask for support;

To gather information.

d. After a meeting has been held, the committee should always ask for a second, or follow-up, meeting. This keeps a foot in the door.

e. The cardinal rule is to get reactions to questions or presentations. The meeting should not be a one-way conversation.

f. Several things can be done two or three days prior to a meeting in order to prepare and organize the committee:

Role play the meeting by going through the agenda.

Verify the time, place and turnout numbers.

Make decisions on assigned roles, what questions to ask, and turnout numbers.

A sample agenda:

1. *Introduction*: name, organization
2. Purpose: 'We are here to...'
3. *Presentations*: 2 to 4 minutes per person
4. *Questions* for officials
5. *Follow-up questions* if not

satisfied with response

6. *Closure*: “Thank you for your time. We won’t take up any more of your time.”

Remember no lingering for individual “chats.” Arrive and leave as a group.

Always evaluate the meetings as a group immediately following the meeting. The purpose is to review what occurred in the meeting, make sure accurate notes are taken and determine what next steps need to be taken, by whom and when. Discuss the following questions:

- a. What was learned from the meeting? What new information was gathered? Is the official supportive, in opposition or wishy-washy?
- b. Were the questions too easy or unclear?
- c. Whom can we check the results of the meeting with?

The Hearing

At any initial hearing, the committee must be prepared to let the governing body know that the minority community is interested in the process and if a citizen committee is to be appointed, then several members of the minority community should be placed on that committee, and that the committee’s membership should fairly reflect the ethnic and racial make-up of the community at large. The committee should also make clear that the minority community is a cohesive political community, representing a unique community of interest. Any plan, therefore, should reflect and protect that community. Finally, the committee should remind the governing body that any plan adopted by the board will be measured for its fairness or lack of fairness *vis-a-vis* the impact it has on minority political strength. The committee must make every effort to have the governing body list in writing the criteria it will consider in drawing a plan.

At any subsequent hearings the committee should be prepared to submit redistricting plans that provide the community with the most effective electoral districts possible. The com-

mittee should never start with a plan that minimizes strength on the belief that the governing body will be reasonable and adopt their plan. Moreover, the committee should make serious efforts to accommodate the governing body’s stated criteria for a districting plan.

At any subsequent hearings the committee should be prepared to submit redistricting plans that provide the community with the most effective electoral districts possible. The committee should never start with a plan that minimizes strength on the belief that the governing body will be reasonable and adopt their plan. Moreover, the committee should make serious efforts to accommodate the governing body’s stated criteria for a districting plan.

In presenting a plan the best strategy is usually to present the plan as a team:

- a. One spokesperson should strongly and forcefully present the plan.
- b. The committee should encourage the minority community to attend the meeting in force.
- c. Have individuals and groups endorse the plan after it is presented.
- d. To best assure support within the minority community, the plan should be developed as a community venture and should be presented to the minority community for support and suggested modifications.
- e. Maps should be clear and data tables accurate.
- f. It is also wise to have copies ready so that the presenters can leave one with the governing body and make a second available to the media. Copies should also be kept for the committee records.

At any hearings on the adoption of a plan, if at all possible, the committee should make its position clear, if the plan that is being adopted is not satisfactory, the committee should urge the

adoption of their plan again and urge further negotiation. Throughout this process it is essential to keep community support or opposition solid.

During all phases of the process it is important to be watchful of attempts to extract concessions by the governing boards and their lawyers. In doing so, here are some hints the committee should pay attention to:

DO's

Comment on the history of the minority community's political participation. Has the participation of minorities been limited in the past? What are examples of electoral districts where minorities are present in large numbers but have little influence on elections? What has been the impact of the current lines on the minority population? What elections have there been (for any seat) in which minorities have run and lost? Is there evidence of racially polarized voting?

Comment on the nature of the minority community today. What towns, areas or neighborhoods have become increasingly made up of minority group residents? Where is the minority community located? Are there identifiable boundaries?

Identify any areas where the minority population is growing and seems that it will keep growing during the 2000's.

Comment on the accuracy of the census in your area. Is there evidence to suggest an undercount of the minority population? (Use 2000 census figures when referring to numbers in your community.)

Instead of using phrases such as "safe districts" or "maximizing minority strength," use "establishing a fair opportunity for Hispanics to participate equally in the political process."

Be brief and direct, choose ahead of time the points you want to make and stick to them in your testimony. Written testimony can be submitted to the committee.

Be prepared to answer questions that the committee may have for you based on your testimony. Know that elected officials may look for reasons to keep the present lines.

DON'T's

Unless there is local evidence to the contrary, you should not offer blanket statements in testimony that might be later used against minority plaintiffs in court. Some of the statements that might be avoided (unless you have empirical evidence to support them) are:

Anglos will vote for minority candidates.

Minorities are too scattered to be effective.

Minorities don't win because they don't vote and are apathetic.

Minorities are their own worst enemies.

Minority groups never support one another.

These statements raise legitimate questions that should be answered in order to better understand the characteristics of minority participation in a local area.

There is no requirement that the committee use any information collected from third parties through hearings, meetings or corresponding in developing their plans, but by following these instructions the committee will place itself and the community it represents in the most effective position possible for advocating a good plan and opposing a bad plan. Moreover, this work will be the foundation for challenges before the Department of Justice under Section 5 of the Voting Right Act or in preparation for litigation.

Dealing With the Media

Occasionally a situation may arise in which the committee will have to deal with hostile media. The following guidelines may be useful in that situation:

Never say anything off the record. If it

shouldn't be seen in print or made public, then don't say it.

Designate one person to be the spokesperson for the group, and make sure everyone in the committee knows who this person is and that all media questions should be answered by that person.

Prepare for interviews by rehearsing the most important points to be made and the kinds of questions that may be asked.

Use accurate information. Try to have documentation that substantiates what is said. Respond openly, or when lacking an appropriate response, answer with an "I don't know."

Demeanor (the way the spokesperson acts) plays a big role in interviews with hostile media. Be calm and courteous as to not create any unnecessary tension.

Always evaluate the meetings as a group immediately following the meeting.

Chapter 3

New Software and how it changes the Landscape

Erase your outdated images of Congressional redistricting .visions of a few state legislators, pencil and paper in hand, poring over census figures as they crunch numbers and draw new boundary lines.

Following a decade of unprecedented growth in the high-tech field, remapping will take place next year on laptop computers using new software that given the right data can design dozens of new districts every minute.

But more importantly, some experts said, lower prices and greater availability of software programs mean that the process, once the province of a handful of statisticians and political strategists, will become more accessible for state legislators, public interest groups and, well, anyone with about \$2,000, a computer and a stake in the redrawing of House districts.

“Now that redistricting can be hosted on a high-end home PC, everyone can play,” commented Tom Hofeller, the top redistricting official with the Republican National Committee, in a ROLL CALL article on redistricting. ‘Lots of interested parties will be coming before [state legislative] committees, presenting their own versions of maps and lobbying on their behalf. Individual legislators can also devise plans.’”

Contributing to this scenario is the breakneck speed with which computers developed in the 90s. The fastest computers used for redistricting 10 years ago offered a processing speed of no more than 25 megahertz. This month, computers with the new Pentium IV processor will run at 1.5 Gigahertz.

New Census Bureau categories will make the process more difficult. In 1990, the bureau released 12 computer columns of information, a move last year to expand respondents’ ability to define their race means there will be 288 columns of data in this year’s results.

Each state will also receive two sets of data .one

using sampling, one using more traditional counting methods. Each state will have to make their own individual choice on which dataset to use.

While software programs are more widely available than they were in 1991, the first year computers were used for redistricting, individuals still will rely on a handful of vendors to produce a limited number of programs.

These programs vary slightly, depending on the degree of demographic intensity required.

CALIPER, Inc.: Maptitude for Redistricting

- lower learning curve
- provide state, county, city datasets
- lower cost than Arc/Info
- antipiracy device requires free parallel port

ESRI, Inc.: Arc/Info

- higher learning curve
- provide state, county, city datasets
- often can find free shapefiles and datasets ready for Arc on net
- higher cost than Maptitude
- preferred tool of demographers and state, county, city planning offices

Generally speaking, the programs require three different sets of data to devise new districts.

First, a redistricting agent must acquire a central map file, which the Census Bureau usually provides. Known as the Topographically Integrated Geographic Encoding Reference (TIGER).

Second, one must obtain the census findings, which for the purposes of redistricting are known as the “PL94 file.” This file is scheduled to be publicly available at the same time that redistricting authorities in each state receive it.

The third set of data gives agents the political statistics .such as party registration .they need to draw districts intended to perform well for a specific political party. The source of this information is less uniform, varying from state to state. Sometimes it is collected by a central authority, such as the secretary of state’s office. Sometimes it is collected by each political party, and sometimes legislative committees collect it.

As remappers assign area features to a district, the district boundaries are redrawn and selected attributes are automatically summarized to reflect the new district's characteristics.

More people will be drawing more plans, which means greater public involvement but also the potential for more errors if not properly supervised by a legal and technical expert.

Chapter 4

Redistricting Timelines

STATE: Arizona

DATES: The 1st regular legislative session following the decennial census. The regular 2001 session will convene before census figures are due to be reported. A special session may be called later in the year to consider redistricting plans.

WHO'S IN CHARGE: The legislature. A bipartisan interim committee of 22 representatives (11 from the house, and 11 from the senate) will be formed to develop a redistricting plan for recommendation to the legislature. The governor has veto power over both the state legislative and congressional plans.

STATE: California

DATES: There are no constitutional deadlines for either congressional or legislative redistricting, but if a deadlock occurs, the impasse goes to the state supreme court.

WHO'S IN CHARGE: The legislature. Each house in the California legislature separately draws its own districts. The Elections and Reapportionment Committee draws the state senate plan. The Committee on Election, Reapportionment and Constitutional Amendments Committee draws the assembly plan. The congressional plan is a result of collaboration between both houses. The governor has veto power over both legislative and congressional plans.

STATE: Colorado

DATES: The constitutional deadline for legislative districts is 90 days after the first meeting of the Reapportionment Commission for a preliminary plan, and an additional 90 days for

a final plan. Given that the commission must convene by July 30, the current deadline for a preliminary plan is October 30, 2001, and the final plan is due on January 26, 2002. The state Supreme Court must approve the plan before March 15, 2002. There is no deadline for congressional districts.

WHO'S IN CHARGE: The legislature draws the congressional districts, while the Reapportionment Commission is responsible for legislative districts. There are no legislative committees exclusively responsible for congressional redistricting. Proposed bills on the subject are assigned to committee after they are proposed. The governor has veto power over the congressional plan only.

The Reapportionment Commission has been in existence since 1974. It is an 11-member, part-legislator, part-civilian body. The majority and minority leaders of both houses each appoint one person, the governor appoints three and the chief justice of the state Supreme Court appoints four. No more than six members can be from one political party. The governor has no veto power over legislative district plans.

STATE: Florida

DATES: There is no redistricting deadline, but the deadline for qualifying for state office is in mid-July of 2002.

WHO'S IN CHARGE: The legislature is responsible for drawing all districts. In the senate it is handled by the Select Committee on Apportionment and Redistricting, and in the house by the Committee on Reapportionment. The Florida state constitution requires that redistricting be done in the 2002 session of the Florida Legislature, or in a special session called by the Governor if districts are not drawn by the end of the regular session. The state Supreme Court will step in if the legislature fails to meet the candidate-qualifying deadline. The Governor has veto power over the congressional plan but not the

state legislative district plan; that plan is adopted by joint resolution of the legislature.

STATE: Idaho

DATES: The deadline is 90 days after the appointment of the Commission for Reapportionment.

WHO'S IN CHARGE: The Commission for Reapportionment draws both congressional and legislative districts. The Commission has six members; no member can be an elected or appointed official. Leaders of the two largest parties in the house and the senate appoint one member for a total of four, and the chairpersons of the two parties with the most votes for governor appoint one each. There is no gubernatorial veto power of either plan.

STATE: Nevada

DATES: June 4, 2001. The legislature must apportion itself at the first legislative session following the decennial census.

WHO'S IN CHARGE: The legislature. The Committee on Government Affairs is responsible for redistricting in the Senate. The Committee on Elections, Procedures and Ethics is responsible for redistricting in the assembly. Only one redistricting plan per caucus is allowed to be voted on by the full legislature. The governor has veto power over both the congressional and state legislative district plans.

STATE: New Mexico

DATES: No specific date.

WHO'S IN CHARGE: The legislature. An interim committee of the legislature will be formed in the fall of 2000. Redistricting plans will most likely be passed in a special session in the fall of 2001. The governor has veto power

over both plans.

STATE: North Carolina

DATES: The deadline for state legislative districts is the end of the first legislative session after the return of the census. There is no specific deadline for congressional districts, but the practical deadline for both plans is far enough before the first Monday in January — which is the beginning of the candidate-qualifying period for primaries — that the Department of Justice has time to preclear the plans.

WHO'S IN CHARGE: The legislature. There is no gubernatorial veto power over redistricting plans.

STATE: Oregon

DATES: There is no congressional deadline. The deadline for state legislative districts is July 1, 2001.

WHO'S IN CHARGE: The legislature is responsible for both plans. A joint interim committee was set up for the last round of redistricting, but in 2001, the house and senate will develop separate redistricting plans. The house rules committee will act as the interim committee; the senate has not made plans as of yet. The secretary of state is responsible for a state legislative plan if the legislature fails to meet its deadline. The governor has veto power over both plans.

STATE: Texas

DATES: There is no congressional deadline. The state legislative deadline is during the first regular session of the Texas Legislature following release of census data. If the legislature fails to redistrict state legislative districts by the constitutional deadline, a Legislative Redistricting Board must convene within 90 days and

prepare a final plan in 60 days.

WHO'S IN CHARGE: The legislature. The Senate Committee of the Whole on Legislative and Congressional Redistricting and the House Committee Redistricting are the committees that have jurisdiction. The governor has veto power over both congressional and state legislative plans.

STATE: Utah

DATES: The deadline for both congressional and state legislative district plans is at the first legislative session following the population count by the United States Census Bureau.

WHO'S IN CHARGE: The legislature is responsible for redistricting. A joint, ad-hoc committee is usually appointed. No preparations have been yet for this round of redistricting. The governor has veto power over both congressional and state legislative district plans.

STATE: Washington

DATES: The state constitutional deadline for congressional and state legislative redistricting is January 1, 2002. The state Supreme Court will draw plans if the commission fails to agree on one or both plans.

WHO'S IN CHARGE: The four-member, civilian Redistricting Commission is responsible for congressional and state legislative district plans. Each majority and minority leader of the senate and house appoints one member of the commission. A fifth, nonvoting member is appointed by the four voting members to serve as chair. Members of the commission cannot be elected officials or party officials. There is no gubernatorial veto power over redistricting plans.

