

W Janti

Minutes of Meeting of April 19, 1971

PRESENT: Chairman, Mary Frazzini, Vice-Chairman, Frank Young
Juanita White, Darrell Dreyer and Ross Prince

OTHERS

PRESENT: Art Palmer and Perry Burnett, Legislative Counsel Bureau;
Fred Duggar, Data Processing; and Grover Swallow, Assemblyman.

The meeting was convened by Frank Young, Chairman for Reapportionment in Room 222 at 9:15 a.m.

Mr. Young's opening remarks concerned the three bills covering reapportionment: A.B. 825, for the 40-20 plan; A.B. 827, for the 18-36 plan; and A.B. 828, for the 44-22 plan. He said that this committee should make the recommendation today, in the committee of the whole, which plan they wanted to go with. The package should be completed today and he had the feeling that they were moving toward the 44-22 plan.

Mr. Dreyer remarked that there was no way the Senate would go for the 44 plan. He also wondered how the problem of the single seat district versus the multi-seat proposed by the Senate would be resolved. The answer was - probably conference committees.

Mr. Burnett believes that Nevada is unique in its problem with the bi-cameral system. Other states resolved some of their problems by having separate arrangements for each house. He believed the most important issue to be resolved was the number and any decision of one house must bear some kind of relation to the decision of the other house. Mr. Palmer said it could be done inequally but asked how much confusion did they want to generate between the two houses.

Mr. Young remarked again that it might be true - if both houses districted on a single seat basis, they would be less vulnerable to a court decision, then if they went to the multi-member district. He felt that the wise course for the Assembly would be to recommend the single-seat district and, even if they should go along with the Senate on the multi-member district, their first choice would be on record. If a court decision or case would later arise, the Assembly could always be on record as preferring the single seat district. Mr. Burnett also agreed, based on a growing number of court decisions and cases, that the single seat district is less likely to be challenged. He also mentioned that the courts might not want to interfere with the making of the over-all plan and might even say - go to an election at large.

In considering the plan introduced by the Senate, Mr. Young felt that the Assembly should first receive skeleton bills to go along with it on the other Boards and Commissioners. The Senate has only districted itself and has given the Assembly no plan at all for districting the Assembly. The package the Assembly plans to introduce for the Senate's consideration will be complete in every respect - including Commissioners, State School Board and further districting of Clark County and Washoe County officials. Mr. Young then asked the question - should we spend any more time considering all three plans?

Motion was made by Mary Frazzini, seconded by Darrell Dreyer, that the committee recommend the 44-22 plan. Motion carried.

Mr. Burnett said that this decision will help them in their work and that the preliminary work should be ready by early this afternoon, but he would check with Mr. McDonald.

Further discussion followed on the various boards for Clark County and districting of outlying areas for school board members

The problems in re-districting of Washoe County were then discussed. These have not been covered in the 44-22 plan as yet. Mr. Burnett said that the bill would provide for readjustment on the basis of the commissioners being selected from the Reno area and one each for the incorporated cities within the county. Mr. Young thought that maybe the Washoe County delegation would want to get together and decide how they want to divide the County Commissioners and that they could use the W-10A map for this purpose. The problem of the school board should also be settled since they now have seven in Washoe County. Mr. Burnett outlined again the decisions in the Fahey-Mulroy case in Clark County, in regards to school board members.

Mrs. Frazzini felt that there would be no opposition from the Washoe County delegation if Washoe County was also divided up (by the computer) into districting for the school board. Mr. Dreyer remarked that, if the job was going to be done properly, the Assembly should look ahead ten years. Under these circumstances, it would be only proper to notify the Washoe County delegation that this districting had to be done in order to provide uniformity. Mr. Young said he would talk to the Washoe County delegation and tell them that this was being done. In final directions to Mr. Burnett and Mr. Palmer, the division of Washoe will be made into the seven districts, showing districting for the School Boards and for County Commissioners.

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 a.m.