

Present: Mary Frazzini, Chairman, Frank Young, Vice-Chairman, Nick Lauri, Juanita White, Darrell Dreyer and Margie Foote

Absent: Rawson prince

Others: Art Palmer and Perry Burnett, Legislative Counsel Bureau; Fred Duggar, Data Processing Center; Jan MacEachern, League of Women Voters, Assemblyman Roy Torvinen.

The meeting was called to order by Vice-Chairman, Frank Young, for further discussion on reapportionment matters and presentation in the Assembly of skeleton bills as recommended by the committee.

The proposed amendments to Section A, NRS 281.030 were read by Mr. Burnett and gone over with the committee. The suggestion was made by Mr. Young of the possibility of including in the bill provisions relating to the two year and four year terms of Senators - that is those who are elected in 1970 and had only served two years, they might be given the four year term, if re-elected in 1972, without being subject to the drawing of lots. This might be constitutionally supportable, Mr. Burnett remarked, providing the language, in effect, says as nearly as possible one half are elected every two years. This was merely a suggestion and several of those present thought the problem should be worked out by the Senate, which is covered somewhat under provisions of S.B. 643 and will become a point of negotiation between the two houses. Mr. Burnett pointed out that section 218.030, of the proposed Assembly bill, might not need any amendments.

Further discussion followed on the 20-40 plan, as covered in the first skeleton bill presented by Mr. Palmer and Burnett. Mr. Young mentioned that A.B. 736 and A.B. 737 would take care of the size of the Regents and State Board of Education for the 20-40 plan. The size of the County Commissioners would not be changed and might be re-districted. Further determination would have to be made regarding the present methods and machinery in election and size of school districts. Mr. Torvinen believed that the skeleton bill should include county commissioners.

Arrangements are to be made so that these various skeleton bills, as prepared by the Counsel Bureau, are not actually printed and made available for mailing and general distribution.

Mr. Young felt that the appropriate map should also be introduced for each skeleton bill so that people can evaluate the complete plan. The maps for the 20-40 plan were reviewed by the committee members. Various problems were discussed, including further break-down of enumeration districts, and trying to decide the proper division of Washoe County and its outlying areas. The map, as prepared by the computer, for the 20-40 plan was then presented by Fred Duggar. In looking at this map, Mr. Young felt that some decision should be made in regard to taking some portion of Washoe County out to add either to Lyon or Carson City. These decisions had to be made before the next step could be taken in running the computer. Mr. Burnett stated that the committee should be willing to accept a disparity in order to maintain the county lines, in view of the over-all thrust of the approach to this whole matter.

Mr. Palmer believed that there might be some problem in the future and questions asked if they broke too many of the county lines in one area and didn't follow this procedure throughout the reapportionment plan .

Mr. Young suggested that Mr. Palmer spend a little more time on the map which would leave Washoe County as an entity and put Storey and Lyon Counties together; then try and get back to the committee later this afternoon when they could possibly have a 10 minute recess.

Further review of Mr. Duggar's computer map was made, which had one of the lowest population disparities produced so far. Mr. Young explained that in this map there had been some work done to create some substantially black districts in Las Vegas, and also maintaining the Las Vegas township boundaries and North Las Vegas, except in Legislative District #7. Only 20 of the 22 districts in this area were expressed on the map since Mr. Duggar said the computer was not able to break down the area around Henderson. Nor did he feel he was knowledgeable enough to know which areas of Henderson could logically be broken out, without involving various, political, ethnic and community of interest problems.

Mr. Young suggested that they make one predominantly Henderson District and peel the rest out and put in with Boulder City. Art Palmer and Fred Duggar will coordinate their maps so that they can be introduced as one package with the 20-40 skeleton bill. Mrs. White will help Mr. Duggar in the division of Henderson on his map.

Further mention was made on the establishment of Senate Districts in relation to the maps and bills as presented by the Assembly. Mention was made of the establishment, in the Assembly Bill, of single seat districts.

Mr. Lauri questioned Mr. Young about the 44-22 plan; which was not ready for presentation. This plan has to be run through the computer as yet. Mr. Duggar remarked that this was a good job, from the computer's point of view, but a bad job from the human point of view.

Mr. Young suggested establishing the following order of priority:  
1. First the 40-20 plan, along with the regent and state school board plans which are on the Chief Clerk's desk; 2. The next package will be the 44-22, an 11 man regent and State School Board plan that will accompany it. Perry should prepare the 44-22 package, with the regent and board bill that parallels A.B. 736 and A.B. 737. He also mentioned that the committee has been asked on the floor to prepare a 36-18 package, and wondered if the committee should give the bill to the Senate and have them introduce it. This suggestion was not acted upon at the meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 12:40 p.m.

B.Sullivan