

Arizona

State website:  
2010-cycle districts:  
2000-cycle districts:  
Primary governing law:

[www.azredistricting.org](http://www.azredistricting.org)  
[Congress, State Legislature](#) « NEW  
[Congress, State Legislature](#)  
[Ariz. Const. art. IV, pt. 2, § 1](#)

The Latest

On Oct. 3, the [independent commission](#) issued [draft maps](#). On December 20, the commission issued [tentative final maps](#); after technical amendments, the [final maps](#) were formally [approved](#) by a 3-2 vote on January 17. The congressional maps were [submitted](#) for [preclearance](#) on Feb. 10, and [precleared](#) on April 9; state legislative maps were [submitted](#) on Feb. 28, and [precleared](#) on April 26. [Litigation](#) has been filed against both sets of plans.

A controversy, allegedly over violations of the state's Open Meetings Law, led to the Nov. 1 impeachment of the commission's chair. After the state Attorney General launched an investigation based on these allegations, seeking a [court order](#) forcing the independent commissioners to cooperate, the commissioners [counter-sued](#), alleging political interference with their process. Before the investigation was complete, the Governor [called for the impeachment](#) of the commission's chair, which was approved by 2/3 of the state Senate; on November 17, the [Arizona Supreme Court](#) found the impeachment improper and reinstated the chair.

Institution

Redistricting political control:

	Governor	State Senate	State House
<a href="#">Congressional lines</a>	Independent commission with balanced partisan composition		
<a href="#">State legislative lines</a>			
2000 cong. lines	Independent commission with balanced partisan composition		
2000 state lines			

Arizona's congressional and state legislative lines are drawn by a five-member [independent commission](#), created by ballot initiative in 2000. For the three years before their appointment to the commission, none of the commissioners may have been appointed to, or a candidate for, any public office; an officer of a political party; a paid lobbyist; or an officer of a candidate's campaign committee.

The state's commission on appellate court appointments nominates 10 Republicans, 10 Democrats, and 5 individuals not registered with either major party; the four legislative leaders (majority and minority leader in each legislative house) each choose one commissioner from this pool of 25 nominees. Those four commissioners then select a fifth tiebreaker who is not registered in the same party as any other commissioner. Each commissioner must be an Arizona voter registered with the same political party (or unaffiliated) for at least three years, and at most two of the first four commissioners may live in the same county. [[Ariz. Const. art. IV, pt. 2, § 1\(3\)-\(8\)](#)]

Current commissioners are listed [here](#).

Timing

Census data were delivered to Arizona on [March 10, 2011](#).

Arizona state law does not impose a particular deadline for drawing congressional or state legislative lines; candidates must file for congressional and state legislative primary elections by May 30, 2012. [[Ariz. Rev. Stat. § 16-311\(a\)](#)]

Arizona prohibits redrawing district lines mid-decade, before the next Census. [Ariz. Const. art. IV, pt. 2, § 1(23)]

## Public input

Public meetings were held around the state in July, August, and September. Video and other materials from past meetings are archived [here](#).

Transparency was also at the heart of a controversy involving the commission's membership. A controversy, allegedly over violations of the state's Open Meetings Law, led to the Nov. 1 impeachment of the commission's chair. After the state Attorney General launched an investigation based on these allegations, seeking a [court](#) order forcing the independent commissioners to cooperate, the commissioners counter-sued, alleging political interference with their process. At the same time, Arizona Democrats issued a [public records request](#) related to the Attorney General's investigation, and requested an unrelated [investigation](#) into alleged omissions and false statements on another commissioner's application. On November 1, 2011, before any of the investigations were complete, the Governor [called for the impeachment](#) of the commission's chair, which was approved by 2/3 of the state Senate; the impeachment was itself subject to [litigation](#).

## Criteria

Like all states, Arizona must comply with constitutional equal population requirements, and state law further asks that districts have equal population to the extent practicable. [Ariz. Const. art. IV, pt. 2, § 1(14)(B)]

Arizona must also, like all states, abide by [section 2 of the Voting Rights Act](#). Arizona is further considered a "[covered state](#)" under [section 5 of the Voting Rights Act](#), with the obligation to submit redistricting plans to the Department of Justice or to the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, to ensure that the plans do not discriminate against minority communities.

The Arizona constitution requires that the district map begin with a "grid-like pattern." Districts are then adjusted to be contiguous, geographically compact, and respect communities of interest -- all to the extent practicable. [Ariz. Const. art. IV, pt. 2, § 1(14); Ariz. Minority Coal. for Fair Redistricting v. Ariz. Ind. Redistricting Comm'n, 121 P.3d 843 (Ariz. Ct. Appeal 2005)] (In 2000, the commission apparently decided to use the "Polsby-Popper" test for compactness, emphasizing the degree to which perimeter boundaries are contorted, but there is some dispute about the extent to which the commission actually used that test.) [Transcript at 164 (Feb. 7, 2004); Definitions]

The state constitution also provides that, to the extent practicable, district lines should use visible geographic features, city, town, and county boundaries, and undivided census tracts. [Ariz. Const. art. IV, pt. 2, § 1(14)] Finally, the state constitution asks that, to the extent practicable, competitive districts be favored where doing so would not significantly detract from the goals above. [Ariz. Const. art. IV, pt. 2, § 1(14); Definitions; Ariz. Minority Coal. for Fair Redistricting v. Ariz. Ind. Redistricting Comm'n, 208 P.3d 676 (Ariz. 2009)]

State legislative districts are, by definition, nested; one Senator and two Representatives are elected from each district. [Ariz. Const. art. IV, pt. 2, § 1(1)]

Party registration and voting history data may not be used in the "initial phase" of the mapping process, but can be used to ensure that plans ultimately meet the goals above. The commission may not consider the homes of candidates. [Ariz. Const. art. IV, pt. 2, § 1(15)]

## 2010 cycle cases

Due to the volume of filings, information on the Arizona cases is located on a [separate litigation page, here](#).

## 2000 cycle

In the **2000 redistricting cycle**, Arizona's commission first drew state legislative maps that drew an **objection** from the Department of Justice. The commission revised their districts, and a federal court **authorized** those districts for use in the 2002 elections, on an emergency basis only. The commission then revised the districts once again, and adopted a final plan on August 14, 2002, which was **precleared** on February 10, 2003.

Arizona's commission also drew congressional maps, which were **precleared** on March 26, 2002.

Both the second state legislative plan and the congressional plan were **challenged** in state court, and both were ultimately upheld. [[Ariz. Minority Coal. for Fair Redistricting v. Ariz. Ind. Redistricting Comm'n](#), 121 P.3d 843 (Ariz. Ct. Appeal 2005); [Ariz. Minority Coal. for Fair Redistricting v. Ariz. Ind. Redistricting Comm'n](#), 208 P.3d 676 (Ariz. 2009)]

## Other state links

[Arizona Competitive Districts Coalition](#) (Contest results [here](#) and [here](#).)

Congress	State legislature	Maps & Data	States			
Current status	Current status		Alabama	Indiana	Nebraska	South Carolina
Timing	Timing		Alaska	Iowa	Nevada	South Dakota
Authority	Authority	<b>Litigation</b>	Arizona	Kansas	New Hampshire	Tennessee
Institution	Institution		Arkansas	Kentucky	New Jersey	Texas
Party control	Party control		California	Louisiana	New Mexico	Utah
Criteria	Criteria	<b>Reform</b>	Colorado	Maine	New York	Vermont
			Connecticut	Maryland	North Carolina	Virginia
			Delaware	Massachusetts	North Dakota	Washington
			Florida	Michigan	Ohio	West Virginia
			Georgia	Minnesota	Oklahoma	Wisconsin
			Hawaii	Mississippi	Oregon	Wyoming
Overview of redistricting		Further resources				
Why it matters	Redistricting criteria	My work	Idaho	Missouri	Pennsylvania	
Public engagement	Preclearance	Tools	Illinois	Montana	Rhode Island	