

NEVADA LEGISLATURE
ASSEMBLY

57TH SESSION

COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS
MINUTES

DATE: Tuesday, April 17, 1973

ATTENDEES: Foote, Chairman
Gojack, Vice Chairman
Crawford
Huff
Vergiels

ABSENCES: Ford
Smith

GUESTS: Assemblyman Glover
Assemblyman Jacobsen
Arthur J. Palmer - Legislative Counsel Bureau
Thomas B. Winters
Pat Potter, Democratic Central Committee, Carson City

Meeting was called to order by Chairman Foote at 4:50 P.M. for the purpose of further discussing SB 62.

Chairman Foote: It was mentioned at the last meeting the areas which needed some further consideration were Carson City and Douglas County and Assemblymen Glover and Jacobsen have talked and have some plans to bring before us.

Assemblyman Glover: Assemblyman Jacobsen and I agreed we would each present the way we would like to go and then let you decide. One of the basic problems in Carson City is the city has been divided into three different parts and three different representatives. It was the No. 1 issue when I campaigned and people are upset. Mr. Palmer says there are several ways we can go. I won't accept any of the enumeration districts I now represent being withdrawn (17, 16, and 7). That way, we can keep all of Carson City together and I personally think the best way to go is exclude from the Carson districts 1, 2 and 3. It keeps the main part of Carson together. I believe this is the way the people in Carson want to go and I would like to keep the whole city together. I presently have everything on the West side clear out to the county line and everything North of 50 to the county line. I would like to have and receive the older section which picks up 12 and 122 and keep the whole city together, including the Capitol Building and Carson complex and give up 1, 2, and 3.

Assembly

COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS MINUTES

Tuesday, April 17, 1973

Page 2

216

Assemblyman Jacobsen: As stated before, we felt the best way was to have each of us give you a report of how we would like to see the division and let you decide. I feel I should take 1 and 17, trying to draw the line and go straight across from Douglas. It contains only two enumeration districts. No. 1 has 2318 and concerns everything South of town, includes Stewart, the industrial complex and the prison, and No. 17 has 1,739. As far as the district is concerned, the two proposals I have are within 25 votes so it is really balanced. The only other proposal is 1, 2, and 12, which fall within the pervue of the court. 12 has 886, 2 has 841, and 1 has 2318. Douglas has 6882. In both areas from the census to now, there is no comparison people-wise. Carson and Douglas have grown. I don't want to get scattered up in 3. I believe 17 should be one of my areas because it connects up at Tahoe but it is still an area that deserves some representation and we are also involved in TRPA in Tahoe. That's about all I can say in regard to the area. My area in Douglas also extends 20 miles from Minden, Topaz, and if I have to take all this and let Alan have the concentrated area I had better move to Carson.

Pat Potter: As a citizen of Carson City, I would like to speak on this. I have spoken to many citizens after the last reapportionment. I know the people felt injured after reapportionment because it maintained to the curve, around, & included part o 17 which Mr. Jacobsen would like to have. If you live in Carson City you feel injured if the people are represented by someone whose main interest is up in the Lake or down in the main county. His other suggestion was to cut into the main part of town. Those people who have been there forever also feel personally injured if they can't be represented by the person who is representing Carson City. In that, Mr. Jacobsen wouldn't; his main votes are coming from someone else. But to cut into the heart of town and take away that part and give it to someone else honestly is hurting the people of Carson and makes them feel you haven't considered their feelings.

Assemblyman Huff: Any way you cut it will cut off a piece of the city, won't it?

Pat Potter: That is true but part of it is more zoned than others and some of it is easier to take than others because they are separated into a different part of town.

Assembly

COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS MINUTES

Tuesday, April 17, 1973

Page 3

217

- Assemblyman Huff: There will always be someone on one side of the street represented by one and across the street represented by others?
- Pat Potter: Yes, but there are pockets of population. Our main part of the residential population is in the area of 17, though I realize some has to go.
- Chairman Foote: Art, do you have anything to say about this? Are those two proposals in line with the disparity problems?
- Mr. Palmer: They fall within the disparity range and will not increase it any more than it is now.
- Chairman Foote: You say there are three programs. Can you give us a list of enumeration districts?
- Mr. Palmer: The one Alan Glover refers to is enumeration districts 1, 2 and 3 would be out of his district. You have to start with a basic figure of Douglas County - it is just 6882 - and you are trying to build it up above 10,700 to prevent your disparity from moving out. 10,743 is the number we've got to get above because if we fall below that we will increase our disparity.
- With the base of 6882, Alan's plan would add No. 1 (2318), No. 2 (841), No. 3 (933), with a total of 10,974. That is a couple hundred more than you needed to keep us safe. The average district would be 11,775 you would be shooting for but as long as you are getting close to that with 10,974, that is acceptable and safe.
- The two plans Lawrence suggested would be Douglas (6882) and he is really concerned with two enumeration districts - the two contiguous to Douglas: No. 17 (1739) and No. 1 (2318), with a total of 10,939. So you can see how close those two plans are.
- The other plan Lawrence mentioned was to take Douglas (6882) add No. 1 (2318) and No. 2 (841) and instead of taking No. 3, take No. 12 (886) and, adding those to Douglas, 1, 2 and 12 is 10,927. So all three are almost identical when you are talking about the people or census tracts.
- Assemblyman Vergiels: The only plan to keep it autonomous is one of those three?
- Mr. Palmer: None can be autonomous. You can't keep it all in one piece. No matter what you do, you are going

Assembly

COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS MINUTES

Tuesday, April 17, 1973

Page 4

218

to move into the settled area in Carson City and subtract some of those people and put them in Douglas. It's just a matter of who you are going to subtract. Unfortunately, it wasn't designed to keep them away from the previously incorporated part of the city. There is an organized area and the Ormsby District.

Assemblyman Vergiels: What Alan wants to do is give Jake 1, 2, and 3?

Mr. Palmer: That's right. Jacobsen suggested that, except replacing 3 with 12. It's a difficult decision to make, no matter how you go at it. The problem is Carson City has too many people and can't stay by itself with only one representative or it would be non-represented. People don't understand this. They feel someone is taking something away from them, but they are really having a representative added. We had to cut Henderson the same way because it has almost identically the same population as Carson City. I don't have any real good solution. The way the town is split now is everything south and everything east of U.S. 50 and 395 with the exception of a very small pocket (about 4 houses) is taken out of Carson now. The difficulty is 11 and 2 are with Lyon County, 12 and 1 are in Douglas County with the Senate side but in the Assembly side they are in Churchill and Storey.

Assemblyman Vergiels: I make a motion 1, 2 and 3 be placed with Jacobsen and the remainder as outlined by Glover be placed in his district.

Assemblyman Gojack: Seconded.

Chairman Foote: It has been moved and seconded to go with the Glover plan.

Assemblyman Vergiels: Question.

Assemblyman Huff: Opposed

Chairman Foote: This plan approved along with the Dini map proposed amendments.

Committee vote is recorded as follows:

Assembly

COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS MINUTES

Tuesday, April 17, 1973

Page 5

219

Bill No. SB 62

Date: January 23, 1973

Sponsor: Senator Dodge

Subject: Provides for reapportionment of Carson City and rural county senatorial districts.

Committee Action: Assemblyman Vergiels moved Enumeration Districts

Date: 4/17/73 1, 2 and 3 be placed with Assemblyman Jacobsen and the remainder as outlined by Assemblyman Glover be placed in his district.

Seconded by: Assemblyman Gojack

Committee Vote:	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Excused</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Foote	X	-	-	-
Gojack	X	-	-	-
Crawford	X	-	-	-
Ford	-	-	-	X
Huff	-	X	-	-
Smith	-	-	-	X
Vergiels	X	-	-	-

Disposition: Assemblyman Glover's plan approved with the Dini map of proposed amendments.

Date: 4/17/73

Meeting was adjourned at 5:25 P.M.

Minutes respectfully submitted by
Marion Smith
Assembly Attache