REDISTRICTING REFORM MOMENTUM
Builds Across the Southeast in 2017
Southeast region that allows electoral victors of any political stripe to manipulate our democratic process to ensure political domination — a legislatively-controlled redistricting process.

As in most U.S. states, legislatures in all nine Southeastern states are charged with drafting both congressional and state legislative districts after each federal census. This system is replete with conflicts of interest. Too often, elected officials prioritize their own re-election and partisan political power over the concerns of the people they represent. Redistricting then becomes a closed-door process focused on maintaining political power, rather than a fair and open exercise driven by citizen input and interests.

Thankfully, there are Southeastern legislators from both major parties stepping up for redistricting reform.

In the first half of 2017, lawmakers in seven out of nine Southeastern states filed redistricting reform bills, totaling approximately 25 proposals (see Appendix). The sheer number of redistricting bills offered in 2017 is a testament to the urgency of meaningful reform before the 2020 census. This momentum also signals a strong desire among dozens of lawmakers — and the millions of voters they represent — to rehabilitate Southeastern politics and democracy.

“You don’t want any part of your district thinking you are not doing your job.”

– SC Sen. Sandy Senn (R-Charleston) on why geographically compact districts are important for South Carolina, in Post and Courier

Too often, elected officials prioritize their own re-election and partisan political power over the concerns of the people they represent.

Beyond this history of political gamesmanship, there is a critical structural component at play in the

Southeast region that allows electoral victors of any political stripe to manipulate our democratic process to ensure political domination — a legislatively-controlled redistricting process.

As in most U.S. states, legislatures in all nine Southeastern states are charged with drafting both congressional and state legislative districts after each federal census. This system is replete with conflicts of interest. Too often, elected officials prioritize their own re-election and partisan political power over the concerns of the people they represent. Redistricting then becomes a closed-door process focused on maintaining political power, rather than a fair and open exercise driven by citizen input and interests.

Thankfully, there are Southeastern legislators from both major parties stepping up for redistricting reform.

In the first half of 2017, lawmakers in seven out of nine Southeastern states filed redistricting reform bills, totaling approximately 25 proposals (see Appendix). The sheer number of redistricting bills offered in 2017 is a testament to the urgency of meaningful reform before the 2020 census. This momentum also signals a strong desire among dozens of lawmakers — and the millions of voters they represent — to rehabilitate Southeastern politics and democracy.

“You don’t want any part of your district thinking you are not doing your job.”

– SC Sen. Sandy Senn (R-Charleston) on why geographically compact districts are important for South Carolina, in Post and Courier

The Southeast¹ is one of the most brazenly gerrymandered regions of our country, with nearly fifty major legal challenges to Southeastern voting maps since the 2010-2011 redistricting cycle. This practice — whereby lawmakers manipulate voting maps to serve their own interests — silences certain voters and creates deep imbalances in our democracy.

The latest round of redistricting began after a surge of Tea Party voters influenced who controlled Southeastern legislatures following the 2010 midterm election. New and old Republican majorities across the region seized on the redistricting opportunity to inoculate themselves from changing political tides and draw themselves into permanent power. With assistance from experts using the latest mapping technology, GOP leaders corralled and excluded voters with incredible precision, creating congressional and legislative maps that increased partisanship and decreased the need for politicians elected from these districts to pay attention to the concerns and needs of ordinary voters.

Relegated to gerrymandered districts for the last six years, impacted voters and lawmakers have begun to chafe under the unrepresentative policies that have emerged from legislative bodies free from meaningful political challenge.

“A lot of people think this is the most important thing happening in government and the biggest problem we have in the United States and Virginia.”

– VA Del. Mark D. Sickles (D-Fairfax), in Richmond Times Dispatch

¹ For the purposes of this research and generating aggregate figures, we count nine states as part of the Southeast US: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia. We recognize that Arkansas, Kentucky, Maryland, and West Virginia are sometimes counted as part of the sub-region, but did not include those states as part of this specific research.
North Carolina’s history of gerrymandering and lawmakers’ current impasse on how to reform the redistricting process reflect the tensions at play region-wide. Similarly, the interest in reform in our state parallels renewed activism on the issue across the Southeast. In this report, Democracy North Carolina highlights a few important and emerging trends, including legislation that would: 1) empower redistricting commissions (in different forms); 2) end prison gerrymandering; and 3) restrict partisan favoritism in redistricting. A detailed summary of the Southeastern redistricting reform bills considered this year is appended to this report, drawn largely from the Brennan Center for Justice’s Redistricting Reform Bill Tracker.

Empowering Redistricting Commissions

Several Southeastern lawmakers proposed sweeping reforms to replace legislature-driven redistricting with more autonomous commissions. Some lawmakers took inspiration from independent models used elsewhere in the country, while others proposed new and untested commission structures.

CITIZEN REDISTRICTING COMMISSIONS

Twelve representatives in Georgia and five in South Carolina sponsored legislation to appoint independent, citizen-led redistricting commissions modeled after California’s Citizens Redistricting Commission. Under these bills, the power to draw voting districts would reside with a body of qualified citizens, balanced by political affiliation, and without conflicts of interest (e.g. commissioners or their family members cannot have recently held elected office). In the Georgia bill, a redistricting plan drafted by a citizen commission would require significant community input and would ultimately come before the General Assembly for a vote. If the General Assembly failed to approve the maps, the citizens commission would have another opportunity to re-draw maps taking into account legislative feedback.

If those maps also failed to garner General Assembly approval, map drawing responsibility would return to the legislature, who would be required to abide by the same criteria as the citizens commission. In the South Carolina version, the maps drawn by an independent commission would ultimately face a public referendum — giving voters the final say on their own districts.

These California-inspired models represent a wholesale departure from how the Southeast draws its maps. And while no action has been taken on either the Georgia or South Carolina bills since early 2017, lawmakers’ willingness to propose such bold, citizen-oriented reforms deserves recognition.

JUDICIAL AND MIXED-MEMBER REDISTRICTING COMMISSIONS

Legislators in North Carolina and Virginia offered bills that would convene seven-member independent redistricting commissions composed entirely of retired state judges. This model — yet to be tested in any other state — is premised on the view that senior judges can exercise greater impartiality in mapmaking and better uphold legal standards for fair boundaries. Under North Carolina’s bill, retired judges from the N.C. Supreme Court or Court of Appeals would be appointed to draw voting maps. The Speaker of the House of Representatives, President Pro Tempore of the Senate, and Governor would each appoint two commissioners from different political parties. North Carolina’s chief justice would appoint one judge, who would effectively serve as a tie breaker. Any proposed map would be subject to a 45-day public comment period before adopted. The General Assembly would have no role in approving the maps.

“This is about promoting good government and reducing the influence of politics in the redistricting process.”

– NC Rep. Jon Hardister (R-Greensboro), in Greensboro News & Record

Under Virginia’s proposal, the power to appoint commissioners would reside with the state Supreme Court. Virginia’s Supreme Court chief justice would first compile a list of twenty-five willing retired
judges. The full state Supreme Court would then directly appoint all seven redistricting commissioners. Both bills stalled in committee.

**Virginia** lawmakers offered another innovative plan that would unite a cohort of partisan and nonpartisan public officials to draw maps. The proposed seven-member Virginia Redistricting Commission would include four political party representatives (appointed by legislative majority and minority leaders), the Auditor of Public Accounts, the State Inspector General, and the Executive Director of the Virginia State Bar.

---

**South Carolina’s Senate Resolution 0341**

South Carolina lawmakers proposed a constitutional amendment — one of the most transformative redistricting proposals in the Southeast this year — to create a nine-member “Independent Reapportionment Commission” to draw the state’s voting maps. Commissioners would be citizens of the state with “relevant analytical skills, the ability to be impartial, and an appreciation for South Carolina’s diverse demographics and geography.” All citizen members would be selected via a transparent process led by an applicant review panel appointed by the state’s Inspector General. The bill would impose thorough conflict of interest requirements on both redistricting commissioners and members of the applicant review panel to safeguard impartiality within the body (e.g. for 10 years prior to their selection, appointees and their immediate families cannot have held public office, worked for an elected official, lobbied, or donated over $2,000 to a campaign).

Notably S.0341 was co-sponsored by a bipartisan group of South Carolina senators. It was first introduced by three Democrats, Nikki Setzler (the chamber’s minority leader), Mia McLeod, and Mike Fanning, but was later endorsed by Republican senators Sandy Senn and Chauncey Gregory. Sen. Senn, elected in 2016 to represent parts of Charleston and Dorchester counties, noted the difficulty of serving voters from sprawling, gerrymandered districts as her reason for supporting the reform effort.

---

**Ending Prison Gerrymandering**

Two bills proposed by lawmakers in **Louisiana** and **Tennessee** would end the currently legal practice of “prison gerrymandering.” Prison gerrymandering counts incarcerated persons as residents of the area where they are incarcerated, rather than at their actual, pre-incarceration homes. It expands the voting power of districts with prisons and jails, typically in less diverse, rural areas, and dilutes the power of other areas, often with large communities of color.

Ending prison gerrymandering is critically important for Southeastern redistricting reformers. At the end of 2010, our region had incarcerated approximately 556 people per 100,000, compared to the national average of 497 people per 100,000. The **Louisiana** and **Tennessee** proposals would require incarcerated individuals to be counted at their last known addresses. Louisiana’s bill would also mandate data sharing between redistricting authorities and departments of correction. In 2016, **Tennessee** enacted a law permitting counties to exclude incarcerated populations when reapportioning local districts. The state’s 2017 bill would go a step further, ensuring that incarcerated persons actually count towards their communities of origin. Four other states — California, Delaware, Maryland, and New York — have also **passed legislation** on this issue over the last decade.
Important partisan gerrymandering cases are also ongoing in Maryland and Wisconsin.

Of the approximately 25 reform bills filed in the Southeast this year, well over half would expressly bar partisan favoritism in redistricting. Partisan and incumbency protection are widely condemned by pro-democracy advocates, but commonplace in our region. Partisan gerrymandering is a central theme in ongoing redistricting litigation in Georgia, North Carolina, and Virginia. Florida is currently the only Southeastern state that explicitly forbids districts from being “drawn with the intent to favor or disfavor a political party or an incumbent.”

Bills filed in Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia (among other examples) would legally prohibit districts from being drawn to assist or hinder a political party, incumbent, or potential candidate. North Carolina and Virginia’s proposals go even further to prohibit the use of political data in redistricting, including incumbent addresses, voter affiliation information, and previous election results — unless required to comply with the Voting Rights Act.

“Partisan political bodies are not good at drawing fair districts that represent the people. There’s too much pressure to maximize partisan advantage.”

– GA Sen. Elena Parent (D-Atlanta), in Atlanta Journal Constitution

Virginia is the only Southeastern state where bills banning use of partisan data passed at least one chamber in 2017. While Republicans control the Virginia House and Senate, as they do throughout the Southeast, 2017 is an election year in the Cavalier

Efforts to end prison gerrymandering are of particular importance in Louisiana. The state incarceraes citizens at a rate nearly twice the national average (or approx. 867 per 100,000 people by the end of 2010), leaving voters extremely vulnerable to unrepresentative population tabulations and mapmaking.

House Bill 228, introduced in Spring 2017 by Rep. Patricia Haynes Smith, sought to ensure that Louisiana’s future political maps better reflect the true compositions of its communities. The bill would require all sheriffs, chief municipal law enforcement officers, and the state Department of Public Safety and Corrections to submit reports to the legislature detailing the demographic information, last known residential address, and incarceration facility address for all adult and juvenile detainees in the state. Legislative staff would then be charged with adjusting the state’s population count reported by the U.S. Census Bureau before redrawing voting maps.

Rep. Smith is a Democrat from East Baton Rouge (67th House District) and a leader of the National Organization of Black Elected Legislative Women (NOBEL Women). She has introduced multiple pieces of legislation addressing challenges at the nexus of criminal justice and democracy. In Summer 2017, she sponsored a bill that would have automatically restored voting rights for former felons five years after their release from prison. While neither this bill, nor HB 228 advanced out of committee during the 2017 session, Rep. Smith’s efforts to address disenfranchised communities in Louisiana offer hope for future progress on the issue.

Restricting Partisan Favorism

Of the approximately 25 reform bills filed in the Southeast this year, well over half would expressly bar partisan favoritism in redistricting. Partisan and incumbency protection are widely condemned by pro-democracy advocates, but commonplace in our region. Partisan gerrymandering is a central theme in ongoing redistricting litigation in Georgia, North Carolina, and Virginia. Florida is currently the only Southeastern state that explicitly forbids districts from being “drawn with the intent to favor or disfavor a political party or an incumbent.”

Bills filed in Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia (among other examples) would legally prohibit districts from being drawn to assist or hinder a political party, incumbent, or potential candidate. North Carolina and Virginia’s proposals go even further to prohibit the use of political data in redistricting, including incumbent addresses, voter affiliation information, and previous election results — unless required to comply with the Voting Rights Act.

“Partisan political bodies are not good at drawing fair districts that represent the people. There’s too much pressure to maximize partisan advantage.”

– GA Sen. Elena Parent (D-Atlanta), in Atlanta Journal Constitution

Virginia is the only Southeastern state where bills banning use of partisan data passed at least one chamber in 2017. While Republicans control the Virginia House and Senate, as they do throughout the Southeast, 2017 is an election year in the Cavalier

2 Important partisan gerrymandering cases are also ongoing in Maryland and Wisconsin.
state, and citizen-led organizations, including a bipartisan blue-ribbon group, continue to build broad public support for reform. The Republican candidate for Lieutenant Governor, who is now a member of the state Senate, and several other conservative Republicans joined Democrats to push three sweeping redistricting reform bills through the Senate. All were blocked in the House.

“This is no longer a Republican versus Democrat issue. We have overwhelming bipartisan support for redistricting reform.”

– VA Sen. Jill Vogel (R-Winchester), in Augusta Free Press

Moving Forward Together on Redistricting

Democracy North Carolina offers the following recommendations to lawmakers across our region to help ensure that the redistricting reform movement continues and that future proposals reflect both the will of Southeastern voters and lessons from our collective history.

Engage Community Groups & Citizens

Community input is imperative for any reform effort that so profoundly impacts our democracy. Lawmakers should actively engage a diverse array of civic organizations when shaping future redistricting bills to ensure that proposals reflect a broad-base of citizen support.

Enhance Bipartisanship

Almost a quarter of the Southeast’s recent redistricting reform bills were sponsored by a bipartisan group of legislators. This trend is encouraging, but cross-party collaboration must go much further. Redistricting reform has undeniable partisan implications, but holds greater importance as a measure of progress toward a representative democracy. The more bills co-sponsored across party lines, the better chance meaningful redistricting reform will pass with broad legitimacy in the South.

Exchange Ideas

Southeastern lawmakers interested in redistricting reform should exchange ideas and support one another to maintain the issue as a legislative priority region-wide. By learning from the successes and challenges in other states, lawmakers can better craft approaches to redistricting reform that are tailored to the history, needs, and interests of their own states.

Southeastern lawmakers stepped up in 2017. Now all of us — lawmakers, advocates, and voters — have a responsibility to continue these efforts to combat gerrymandering and build a movement for better mapmaking. The window for reform before the next round of redistricting is closing, and the Southeast — a region long criticized for our political history — has a chance to lead the way.

This report was written by Sunila Chilukuri, a Summer 2017 Policy Intern for Democracy NC and 2018 MPP candidate at the Kennedy School of Government, and edited by Isela Gutiérrez, Associate Director of Research at Democracy NC.

We are grateful to Democracy NC colleagues Sunny Frothingham, Senior Researcher, Jen Jones, Communications & Digital Strategy Director, and Bob Hall, Executive Director, for their research assistance and careful review.

Redistricting reform has undeniable partisan implications, but holds greater importance as a measure of progress toward a representative democracy.

3We counted bills as “bipartisan” if sponsors include at least one member from both the Democratic and Republican parties.
## APPENDIX: SOUTHEAST REDISTRICTING REFORM BILLS OF 2017

**Primary Source: Brennan Center for Justice**  •  Bills Tracked as of September 25, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>House Bill</th>
<th>Senate Bill</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Bill Summary (from Brennan Center)</th>
<th>Sponsors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Florida | HB41 | SB774 | 5/5/2017 House bill died in Public Integrity and Ethics Committee without a vote or any formal action. 5/5/2017 Senate bill died in Ethics and Elections Committee without a vote or any formal action. | “Creates a nine-member advisory commission appointed by legislative leaders and the Governor to draft and submit congressional and state legislative maps for approval of the Legislature; establishes mechanisms for public comment online and in person before proposals are submitted.” | House Sponsors: Jenne (D, Primary), Abruzzo (D), Baez (D), Berman (D), Cortes (D), Geller (D), Mercado (D), Russell (D), Smith (D), Stark (D)  
Senate Sponsor: Rodriguez (D) |
| Florida | HB953 | SB 352 | 5/5/2017 Various iterations of the Senate bill passed both legislative chambers. However, the legislative session ended before the latest version of the bill (as amended by the Senate) could pass the House. Thus the bill died. | “Requires an immediate hearing to be scheduled for any redistricting map challenged in state court but requiring elections to take place under the current districts currently if the court challenge is still pending on the 71st day before the primary election; establishes non-binding procedures for public oversight of the process of drawing a remedial map.” | House Sponsor: Ahern (R)  
Senate Sponsor: Huston (R) |
| Georgia | HR2 | SR7 | 1/23/2017 House bill assigned to Legislative and Congressional Reapportionment Committee. No committee meetings or formal action taken on bill after assignment. 1/25/2017 Senate bill referred to Reapportionment and Redistricting Committee. Hearing was held, but no formal action taken on the bill. | “Constitutional amendment providing procedures and standards for state legislative and congressional redistricting; prohibits districts to be drawn with intent to (dis)advantage an incumbent or political party, or deny equal opportunity for minorities to elect their candidates of choice.” | House Sponsors: Gardner (D), Oliver (D), Kendrick (D), Dreyer (D), Frye (D), Smith (D)  
Senate Sponsors: Parent (D), Jones II (D), Butler (D), Henson (D), Tate (D), Rhett (D) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Sponsors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>HR3</td>
<td>1/23/2017</td>
<td>House bill assigned to Legislative and Congressional Reapportionment Committee. No committee meetings or formal action taken on bill after assignment.</td>
<td>“Constitutional amendment establishing a fourteen-member citizen commission for congressional and state legislative redistricting, assembled by a panel of retired judges and the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court; commission must conduct at least one public hearing in each congressional district; prioritizes criteria including compliance with the Voting Rights Act, contiguous and compact districts, and maintaining communities of interest and prohibits the drawing of districts to (dis) favor a political party or incumbent.”</td>
<td>House Sponsors: Gardner (D), Oliver (D), Kendrick (D), Dreyer (D), Frye (D), Smith (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR6</td>
<td>1/25/2017</td>
<td>Senate bill referred to Reapportionment and Redistricting Committee. Hearing was held, but no formal action taken on the bill.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senate Sponsors: Parent (D), Henson (D), McKoon (R), Jones II (D), Butler (D), Rhett (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>HB228</td>
<td>5/10/17</td>
<td>Bill failed in a vote for a favorable report in the Committee on House and Governmental Affairs and was involuntarily deferred. The bill would have required a favorable two-thirds committee vote to be placed back on the committee agenda but is officially dead due to the conclusion of the 2017 legislative session.</td>
<td>“Mandates that incarcerated persons are counted at their pre-incarceration home addresses for purposes of drawing electoral boundaries; mandates procedures for collection of home address data and transmission to redistricting authorities.”</td>
<td>House Sponsor: Smith (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Bill Number</td>
<td>Action Details</td>
<td>Sponsorship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>HB200</td>
<td>2/28/2017 House bill referred to Committee on Rules, Calendar, and Operations of the House. No hearings or formal action taken on bill after assignment. 6/22/2017 Senate bill re-referred to Select Committee on Elections (from Committee on Rules and Operations of the Senate). No formal action taken on the bill since committee re-assignment.</td>
<td>House Sponsors: McGrady (R, Primary), Stevens (R, Primary), Jordan (R, Primary), Hardister (R, Primary), Adcock (D), Ager (D), Ball (D), Beasley (D), Belk (D), Brockman (D), Butler (D), Carney (D), Faircloth (R), Farmer-Butterfield (D), Fisher (D), Fraley (R), Gill (D), Goodman (D), Duane Hall (D), Hanes (D), Harrison (D), Henson (R), Holley (D), Horn (R), Hunter (D), Insko (D), John (D), Lehman (D), Lucas (D), G. Martin (D), Meyer (D), R. Moore (D), Quick (D), Reives (D), B. Richardson (D), Terry, B. Turner (D), Willingham (D), Wray (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB209</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senate Sponsors: J. Jackson (D), Woodard (D), Chaudhuri (D, Primary), Foushee (D), Van Duyn (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Bill ID</td>
<td>Status / Details</td>
<td>Sponsor(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>HB735</td>
<td>Bill referred to Committee on Rules, Calendar, and Operations of the House. No hearings or formal action taken on bill after assignment.</td>
<td>Blust (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Constitutional amendment creating a nine-member independent commission, appointed by legislative leaders, to use a computer program to draw congressional and state legislative maps; establishes redistricting criteria; prohibits consideration of political, electoral, or demographic data.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>SB0341</td>
<td>2/1/17 Referred to Senate Committee on Judiciary. No meetings, sub-committee assignment, or action taken on the bill after initial assignment.</td>
<td>Setzler (D), McLeod (D), Fanning (D), Senn (R), Gregory (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Constitutional amendment creating a nine-member independent commission, selected by an Applicant Review Panel, to draw congressional and legislative maps for voters to approve at the next general election; establishes redistricting criteria; prohibits drawing districts that (dis)favor an incumbent, candidate, or political party.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>HB183</td>
<td>3/22/2017 House bill inactive in the Subcommittee of the State Government Committee. The bill was pulled from the subcommittee calendar by its sponsor.</td>
<td>Favors (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB1380</td>
<td>2/13/2017 Senate bill referred to Senate State and Local Government Committee. Has yet to be placed on the committee calendar for discussion.</td>
<td>Tate (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;For the purposes of creating boundaries for congressional elections, state legislative elections, and county legislative bodies, mandates that incarcerated individuals be counted at their last known residence before incarceration if the individuals are residents of the state; population count shall not include individuals who were both incarcerated in state or federal correctional facilities and were not residents of the state prior to incarceration.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>HB845</td>
<td>3/29/2017 House bill failed a vote in the Subcommittee of the State Government Committee.</td>
<td>Fitzhugh (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB832</td>
<td>3/29/2017 Senate bill referred to the Judiciary Committee after failing a motion to be heard in the Government Operations Committee. Bill remains inactive in Judiciary and has not been placed on the Judiciary calendar.</td>
<td>Yarbro (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Creates a five-member commission to draw congressional districts for approval of the legislature; requires the commission to hold public meetings; establishes redistricting criteria; bars commission from considering political data unless to comply with the Voting Rights Act.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Bill Number</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Sponsor(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>SJR0110</td>
<td>4/19/17</td>
<td>Constitutional amendment creating a five-member commission, selected by the General Assembly, to draw state legislative lines; establishes redistricting criteria; prohibits the use of political data, except as necessary to comply with federal law; requires all meetings by the commission to be open to the public; provides that the General Assembly may not amend, nor may the Governor veto, redistricting plans adopted by the commission.</td>
<td>Yarbro (D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>SJ231</td>
<td>2/17/17</td>
<td>Constitutional amendment creating a seven-member commission, comprised of four members appointed by legislative leaders and three independent public officials, for congressional and state legislative redistricting; setting criteria for drawing districts; prohibiting drawing districts to favor a political party or incumbent and barring, among other things, the use of political affiliations of registered voters for drawing districts.</td>
<td>Kory (D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SJ260</td>
<td>1/31/17</td>
<td>Resembles SJ231, but instead proposes to create an eight-member redistricting commission. Also proposes that districts be competitive (to the extent possible) and that the commission maintain &quot;a partisan balance of districts by [requiring] half of the districts [to] be more favorable than the statewide vote to the top two political parties.&quot;</td>
<td>Barker (D), Marsden (D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SJR280</td>
<td>1/31/17</td>
<td>Constitutional amendment to prohibit partisan, incumbent, or candidate favoritism in redistricting. Prohibits the use of political data in redistricting, except to enable minority voters to elect representation of their choice.</td>
<td>Lewis, Jr. (D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Virginia SB1206

1/31/17 Bill defeated after failing a motion by the Privileges and Elections Committee to be reported to the full Senate chamber.

“Assigning congressional and state legislative redistricting to the Division of Legislative Services; establishing criteria for redistricting; establishing a five-person temporary redistricting advisory commission to assist the Division with the redistricting process.”

Senate Sponsors: Lewis, Jr. (D, Primary), Marsden (D)

Virginia HJ581 SJR290

2/8/17 House bill inactive in Privileges and Elections Committee after the Constitutional Subcommittee voted to lay the bill on the table.

2/17/17 Senate bill passed the Senate and moved to the House for consideration. Referred to House Privileges and Elections Committee, who voted to pass over the bill indefinitely. Bill remains inactive in the House committee.

Constitutional amendment to prohibit favoritism in redistricting. Similar to SJR280, HJR696, and HJR763.

House Sponsor: Sullivan, Jr. (D)

Senate Sponsor: Howell (D, Primary), Vogel (R, Primary), Petersen (D)

Virginia HJR628 SJR269

2/8/17 House bill inactive in Privileges and Elections Committee after the Constitutional Subcommittee voted to lay the bill on the table.

1/31/17 Senate bill incorporated into SJ231 by the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Resembles SJ231, but instead proposes to create a thirteen-member redistricting commission.

House Sponsors: Plum (D, Primary), Boysko (D), Heretick (D), Hope (D), Kory (D), Krizek (D), Levine (D), Lindsey (D), Mullin (D), Price (D), Rasoul (D), Simon (D), Tyler (D), Watts (D)

Senate Sponsor: Deeds (D, Primary), Marsden (D)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Virginia</th>
<th><strong>HJR651</strong></th>
<th>2/8/17 House bill inactive in Privileges and Elections Committee after the Constitutional Subcommittee voted to lay the bill on the table.</th>
<th>“Constitutional amendment creating a seven-member nonpartisan redistricting commission, composed of retired judges to draft and submit state legislative maps for approval of the Legislature; establishes redistricting criteria, including a prohibition on (dis)favoring a political party or incumbent and requiring to the extent practicable that a map promote competition.”</th>
<th>House Sponsors: Carr (D), Hester (D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td><strong>HJR696</strong></td>
<td>2/8/17 House bill inactive in Privileges and Elections Committee after the Constitutional Subcommittee voted to lay the bill on the table.</td>
<td>Constitutional amendment to prohibit partisan, incumbent, or candidate favoritism in redistricting. Similar to HJR581, SJR290, SJR280, and HJR696, but also denies “legislative privilege to communications or documents prepared by a legislator or a legislator’s staff or constituent during redistricting.”</td>
<td>House Sponsors: Price (D, Primary), Bell (D), Boysko (D), Kory (D), Lindsey (D), Mullin (D), Plum (D), Simon (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td><strong>HJR749</strong></td>
<td>2/8/17 House bill inactive in Privileges and Elections Committee after the Constitutional Subcommittee voted to lay the bill on the table.</td>
<td>Resembles SJ231, but requires the proposed redistricting commission to “use the Shortest Split method to draw equal population districts.”</td>
<td>House Sponsors: Bell (D, Primary) Boysko (D), Heretick (D), Kory (D), Levine (D), Plum (D), Rasoul (D), Simon (D), Watts (D) Senate Sponsors: Surovell (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td><strong>HJR763</strong></td>
<td>2/8/17 House bill inactive in Privileges and Elections Committee after the Constitutional Subcommittee voted to lay the bill on the table.</td>
<td>Constitutional amendment to prohibit favoritism in redistricting. Similar to HJR581, SJR290, SJR280, and HJR696.</td>
<td>House Sponsors: Landes (R, Primary), Anderson (R)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Virginia | HB2160 | SB846 | 2/8/17 House bill passed over indefinitely by Privileges and Elections Committee and remains inactive.  
2/6/17 Senate bill passed the Senate and moved to the House for consideration. Referred to House Privileges and Elections Committee, who voted to pass over the bill indefinitely. Bill remains inactive in the House committee. | “Creates a seven-member interim redistricting commission to draw remedial congressional and state legislative redistricting plans in the event the General Assembly’s plans are declared unlawful or unconstitutional; establishing criteria for apportionment, including a ban on drawing districts for the purpose of favoring or disfavoring any political party, incumbent, or candidate.” | House Sponsor: Rasoul (D)  
Senate Sponsor: Lucas (D) |
| Virginia | HB2280 | SB1133 | 2/8/17 House bill inactive in Privileges and Elections Committee after the Constitutional Subcommittee voted to lay the bill on the table.  
2/2/17 Senate bill inactive in Finance Committee after a committee vote to pass by the bill indefinitely. | “Providing for a statewide advisory referendum in the November 2017 general election on whether the General Assembly should adopt a resolution to propose an amendment that would establish an independent commission to draw Virginia’s congressional and state legislative districts.” | House Sponsor: Ward (D)  
Senate Sponsor: Mason (D) |