



**Redistricting Criteria used by Model Redistricting States
July, 2017**

District Criteria and Criteria Measurement should be:

- **Politically neutral** (*not* unduly favoring or disfavoring any political party or individual) as determined by the Efficiency Gap measurement. No individual addresses (such as the addresses of candidates or incumbents) should be used.
- **Compact and Contiguous** as measured by at least two different tests (Polsby-Popper, Reock, or other similar tests).
- Communities of interest should be considered. Avoid dividing precincts, cities and counties to the extent practicable.
- Compliant with the **Voting Rights Act**: Specifically, districts must be designed so that, based on a totality of the circumstances, the election process is equally open to participation by the members of a protected class; and cohesive groups of minority voters usually have the **opportunity to elect the candidate of their choice**, as determined by a multi-year Polarized Voting Analysis or similar quantitative assessment if court schedule allows time for assessment.

Transparent process: Live-stream all meetings to build citizen confidence in the process. Share with the public details about tools and information used by staff legislators, consultants, and contractors, such as computer software, assumptions, formulas, terms and standards.

Chart - highlights seven redistricting reform model states and their redistricting criteria contrasted to NC

Model Reform States	Compact & Contiguous	Retain political boundaries As possible	Nest House within Senate Districts	Communities of interest when possible	No undue favoritism to party or individual	Encourage competition	Population deviations no less than 1% on average**
Arizona	X	X	X	X		X	
California	X	X	X	X	X		
Idaho	X	X		X	X		
Montana	X	X	X	X	X		X
Washington	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Hawaii	X	X	X	X	X		
Iowa	X	X	X		X		X
CONTRAST							
NC	X	X		X			