

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Horn
Vice-Chairman Bedrosian
Mr. Barengo
Mrs. Cavnar
Mr. Hickey
Mr. Malone

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. Harmon (excused)

GUESTS PRESENT: William D. Swackhamer, Secretary of State
David L. Howard, Chief Deputy Secretary of State
Fred Dugger, Central Data Processing
Arthur J. Palmer, Director, LCB
Andrew P. Grose, Research Director, LCB
Lisa Casteel, Intern
Susan Ball, Intern
Elaine Deming, Intern
Mathew L. Ouillett
Esther Nicholson, League of Women Voters
Carl Nicholson

Mr. Horn called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m. and announced that the next meeting would be on January 29th at which time the committee will consider three bills, AB 13, AB 89 and AB 114. He added that today's meeting was more of an orientation session and that Secretary of State, William Swackhamer, and his assistant, David Howard, would discuss how their office relates to elections.

Mr. Swackhamer stated that the State of Nevada has an excellent election system. Ballot positions are easy to gain, initiative and referendum are available, an effective recall system is in use except that in small counties it takes too few signatures and in large counties it takes so many that administratively it is almost impossible to recall an officer. He suggested that instead of a straight twenty-five percent the committee might want to consider a varying percentage of signatures depending on the size of the county involved. Qualifying a new political party and gaining and retaining ballot position is fairly simple in this state requiring a five percent vote for one of that party's candidates. He added that it is easy to register to vote and that a citizen of Nevada is pretty sure that his vote will be counted correctly. He stated that a senatorial recount a few years ago differed by only eleven votes.

One of the problems of the Secretary of State's office is that except in Washoe and Clark Counties where there are election departments the election process is an additional load on often overworked county clerks and county clerk treasurers,

and they are not able to keep abreast of election laws and procedures. Mr. Swackhamer stated that, because of this, elections were not uniform statewide, and to correct this problem he asked the committee's help in enabling his office to conduct a two-day school for election officials throughout the state once every two years before the election process starts. He added that there would be no additional cost for conducting this school as he and Mr. Howard would be running it. He stated that he felt if county clerks and one assistant were required to attend that they should be paid mileage and per diem. He asked that if the committee felt this was a viable idea they might provide the legislation. He added that a small appropriation would also be necessary.

Mr. Hickey stated that he felt the county of origin should be responsible for the cost of attendance at the school.

Mr. Swackhamer answered that this would be a determination of the committee, but he felt that if the state was going to require attendance at a school conducted by the state, his office should pay for it. He also felt that if the state did not pay for this schooling, the counties would not send their officials.

Mr. Hickey felt that if the counties were told they could not run the election without attendance, they would certainly come.

Mr. Swackhamer stated that another problem his office has encountered is that only eight of the seventeen counties in the state are using the punch card system for voting. He added that now there is a small hand-held computer available for the counting of ballots and it would be possible for all the counties to use a uniform punch card system, giving faster and more accurate returns. He explained that by law the state must provide ballot paper which must be purchased in minimum amounts and which accounts for a large expenditure of their budget. He asked for the committee's consideration and help on a bill that has been introduced that will allow the secretary of state's office to loan money to the counties to purchase these devices and then repay the state over a period of years. He added that the counties will recover the money over the years as the punch card system is a less expensive way to operate an election because a counting board is not needed; the office staff does the counting. He stated that the savings on ballot paper would be eight to ten thousand dollars a year.

Mr. Swackhamer went on to say that it has been the custom of his office to publish a booklet on the primary and general election returns for each year. He stated that because of the exorbitant cost of printing the primary election results, there would not be a general election booklet. He said that election results were available in his office to anyone wanting this information.

Mr. Swackhamer noted that there were several bills introduced to the legislature that would provide for a special election on the repeal of the sales tax on food. He added that some of these bills list an expenditure for paper ballots, but that paper allowed by law was available if such an election was held.

One of the things that Mr. Swackhamer's office has tried to do in the last few years is to have election officials call his office for opinions on problems. He said that his office does have statutory authority to give directions and that using the office as a central clearing house for problems leads to more uniformity in elections.

Mr. Swackhamer added that the legislature amended the law to require his office to make a compilation of candidates expenditures and campaign contributions. He explained that it was a monumental task and that he did not feel it was very worthwhile. He recommended that the committee change the compilation portion to require only compilation of statewide offices, judgeship offices and the legislative offices.

Mr. Hickey asked if Mr. Swackhamer were in favor of eliminating county commissioners and city commissioners.

Mr. Swackhamer answered that he would not be in favor of eliminating the reporting requirement when candidacy is filed. He said information concerning campaign contributions would be available on a local level, but that his office should not have to compile the data on county officials.

Mr. Horn asked Mr. Swackhamer to send the committee two letters, one regarding the school for the county clerks indicating the amount of money that would be appropriate for each session that could be attached to a bill drafting request, and another regarding changes in compiling of reports.

Mrs. Cavnar asked what penalties now exist in laws relating to the filing of financial statements in campaign practices and if any steps had been taken in this direction.

Mr. Swackhamer answered that the penalty was a gross misdemeanor and that eight names had been turned over to the Attorney General's office. He added that some have been dismissed and some have been bound over for trial to the district court in Carson City. He explained that he did not know about the counties as those failing to file there were turned over to the district attorney's office. He added that out of 1,026 filing for the primary election, 100 failed to file or file completely. He added that there were none in the general election.

Mr. Hickey asked if the dates and time lags were adequate for the management of this.

Mr. Swackhamer stated that the only problem was that the statute requires that his office make a compilation within 10 days after

the receipt from the county clerks but it was not stated when the county clerks must submit them.

Mr. Horn asked if Mr. Swackhamer's office had a posture on postcard registration.

Mr. Swackhamer explained that officially his office had not taken a position, but that personally he felt that rather than have the people blindly going to the polls to vote, it was better to concentrate on those who were interested in the election process and would give some thought to issues and candidates. He feels that a person who would take the time to go register would be an interested person, and he would rather see fifty percent of the eligible voters turning out for an election that had given some thought to it than ninety-eight percent, half of whom have never given it a thought before they enter the booth.

Mr. Horn thanked Mr. Swackhamer and stated he would appreciate any help towards cleaning up the election laws.

Mr. Horn asked that the secretary mark Mr. Barengo present and Mr. Harmon excused.

Mr. Horn asked Mr. Howard to give the committee an overview of what might be coming up in the future.

Mr. Howard, Chief Deputy Secretary of State, stated that he felt the key words for elections in Nevada should be uniformity and simplicity and that to a degree we have that now. He stated that we have the simplicity and hope to have the uniformity in the near future. He added that it had been demonstrated in the rural counties that a forty percent savings in election costs could be realized with punch card voting.

Mr. Horn asked if the bill had been introduced covering the loan to counties for the punch card system.

Mr. Howard answered that the bill had been introduced to the senate. He added that he had found this statute in the Kentucky Revised Statutes which provides that the secretary of state's office purchase all voting equipment and supplies and lease with option to buy to the counties. This provides control of the type of equipment and type of supplies making a uniform system. He feels we should be looking at this now particularly because all the counties are interested in the punch card system.

Mrs. Cavnar asked if the proposed budget allowed for this type of expense.

Mr. Howard stated that the bill provides for three ways to pay for the system: 1) A direct allocation from the legislature; 2) purchasing from the general operating excess; or 3) through bonding. He added that bonding would not be practical because the total cost would only be approximately \$100,000 for the entire state.

Mr. Howard stated that he would like to touch on three major problem areas. He said that without exception all counties experienced some difficulty in conducting their 318 district elections this year because of conflicts in the law passed by the legislature last session concerning the 318 districts. He added that there are simple solutions. First he would recommend that the committee make some determination of who will run the 318 district and make it very specific in the statute and also whether an individual registration for 318 district voters will be required. These points are not clear and were handled in various ways by the counties.

Mr. Barengo asked if you were a property owner in one part of the county and lived in another part, could you vote in both districts.

Mr. Howard answered that you could not do that now as in the past. Mr. Howard added to the above that Douglas County experienced a doubling of election costs last year because of the problem with the 318 district legislation of 1977.

Mr. Howard went on to say that another problem area was more and more petitions statewide and locally. He added that their office had to accept and verify all statewide petitions for placement on the ballot, recall of an officer, etc., and they have no way to ascertain whether it is a legitimate petition and must take them at face value. He feels that some clarity should be made in this situation. He stated that for a petition on the county level the county clerk must take the signatures on the petition and verify them against the voter registrations, and the secretary of state's office can not do that at this time. He did not know how to solve this problem unless the county clerks verified the signatures before sending them to the secretary's office.

Mr. Howard stated that they had had enough experience with the punch card system to know that it is the best available right now. He added that the biggest problem comes in recounts when the people count the ballots. He stated that there will be a senatorial election in 1980 and their office would like to have a uniform system, along with uniform rules and regulations, before then.

Mr. Horn introduced Mr. Andrew P. Grose, Research Director, to speak on reapportionment and the committee's minor role in this.

Mr. Grose said that he had mistakenly displayed maps in room 214 and suggested that the committee adjourn to that room after his presentation so that he might explain these charts.

Mr. Grose then introduced Mr. Ken Creighton, a new member of the Research Division, who is assigned to the Elections Committee. He added that while a graduate student at U. C. Davis he interned with the California Assembly Elections Committee.

Mr. Grose proceeded with his presentation which is attached to these minutes as Exhibit A. He handed out to each Assemblyman a glossary of census terms which is attached to these minutes as Exhibit B, a census timetable with a dotted line to show progress to date attached as Exhibit C, and subjects of the census questions for 1980 attached as Exhibit D. He explained that on the list of questions, the short list is the questions that everyone in the nation will receive and the long list will be given to 50 percent of the population in political subdivisions of 5,000 or less and to 15 percent of populations over 5,000. This means that a total of 21 percent of the nation will answer the long questionnaire.

At the end of his presentation Mr. Grose asked Mr. Fred Dugger to describe the role of Central Data Processing and the computer in the 1971 redistricting.

Mr. Dugger stated that he was delighted that the committee was taking an early interest in the problem of redistricting. He stated that the basic role of the computer in redistricting was to overcome the complexity of putting together over 400 different enumeration districts.

Describing the process of redistricting the metropolitan areas, he stated that with consideration of the size of the assembly, size of the senate and the bodies to be redistricted, the census data would be entered into the computer and the computer program would carve out the appropriate number of districts with the optimal mathematical balance, contiguity and compactness. This information would then be transferred to maps which are more readable.

He said that one of the problems that the committee might expect is that of how many maps will be generated and how many alternatives should be available, three or three thousand. He explained that some criteria should be set aside to reduce the number of options.

Mr. Hickey asked how many different criteria the computer could handle.

Mr. Dugger answered that the existing computer program which would be most economical and practical considers only compactness, contiguity and mathematical equality of population.

Mr. Hickey asked whether consideration might be given on certain issues, whether they are conservative or liberal districts.

Mr. Dugger said that this can be done but will increase the complexity of the computer programming tremendously. Considering each one of those things as an additional dimension, one dimensional is easy to see; two dimensional, not bad; three dimensional can be visualized; seven dimensional is very complex.

Mr. Barengo asked Mr. Dugger if, since the size of the Legislature is one of the criterion, he saw any need to change that criterion.

Mr. Dugger stated that this was not up to him, but that it was under consideration before.

Mr. Hickey asked if the cost went up as the complexity increased.

Mr. Dugger answered that the most straight forward approach to use, if the previous redistricting was considered successful, would be to repeat the same process. In terms of dollars and cents the previous redistricting cost around \$20,000. He added that at that time similar size redistricting efforts in other states were going to independent contractors at around \$75,000 and the contractors were losing money.

Mr. Horn thanked Mr. Dugger and said he hope the committee could feel free to call upon him as they study these problems, particularly with the idea of an interim study and the components and purpose of that study. He added that Senator Gibson had shown favorable interest in this provided a meaningful purpose of the study is apparent.

Mr. Palmer made the observation that in the fifties this could be done with a pencil and scratch paper, in the sixties they resorted to an ordinary calculator, and now we are in the computer stage. He stated that you can no longer hold to county lines. He said that one of the terms that would be heard in the 1981 session is "disparity" which means that one district may be twice the size of another so that there is a two to one disparity. He added that there must be guidelines as to whether you are dealing with twenty or twenty-one senators, or with thirty-nine assemblymen or forty-five. He explained that there is a latitude within the constitution of an aggregate number of seventy-five members, the senate not being larger than half the size of the assembly or smaller than one third.

Mr. Horn called a two minute recess at 4:05 p.m. after reminding the committee that they would meet on Monday, January 29th, to consider three bills and on Monday, February 5, to consider another two bills.

The committee and guests then proceeded to room 214 where Mr. Grose explained maps showing census tracts with block numbers, enumeration districts with population figures, and political townships.

Mr. Horn adjourned the meeting at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia Hatch

Patricia Hatch
Assembly Attache

PRESENTATION TO ELECTIONS COMMITTEE
January 23, 1979

Andrew P. Grose

CHAIRMAN HORN'S PRINCIPAL CONCERN ABOUT THE 1980 CENSUS IS HOW IT WILL RELATE TO 1981 REAPPORTIONMENT AND--AS AN EXTENSION OF THAT--WHAT CAN YOUR COMMITTEE THIS SESSION DO TO PREPARE FOR 1981.

I WAS NOT HERE IN 1971 BUT WE HAVE TWO PEOPLE HERE WHO WERE. FRED DUGGER FROM CENTRAL DATA PROCESSING DID MOST OF THE COMPUTER WORK THAT YEAR. THE COMPUTER WAS USED FOR CLARK AND WASHOE COUNTIES ONLY. THE REST OF THE STATE WAS DONE MANUALLY AND ART PALMER, WHO WAS RESEARCH DIRECTOR IN 1971, DID THAT PORTION.

I'D LIKE TO EXPLAIN SOME BASIC CENSUS TERMINOLOGY, EXPLAIN BRIEFLY HOW THE 1970 CENSUS WAS CONDUCTED AND THEN TELL YOU A BIT ABOUT HOW THE 1980 CENSUS WILL PROCEED. THERE ARE A NUMBER OF PREPARATIONS UNDERWAY NOW AND WE HAVE ALREADY BEGUN OUR INVOLVEMENT WITH THESE PREPARATIONS. YOU HAVE A HANDOUT THAT IS A CENSUS TIMETABLE. YOU HAVE ANOTHER THAT CONTAINS THE SUBJECTS OF THE QUESTIONS IN 1980.

THE AGENDA FOR THIS MEETING IN THE HISTORY SAYS I'LL TALK ABOUT BUILDING BLOCKS. IT SO HAPPENS I'VE LAID A LOT OF BLOCKS--CONCRETE, CINDER AND SLUMPSTONE--BUT IN THE CONTEXT OF THE CENSUS, BUILDING BLOCKS MEANS THOSE CENSUS UNITS USED IN APPORTIONMENT.

BEFORE WE PROCEED, THERE ARE TWO BASIC TERMS THAT NEED TO BE DEFINED. TECHNICALLY, APPORTIONMENT AND REAPPORTIONMENT REFER ONLY TO SEATS IN THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES. REPRESENTATION IS "APPORTIONED" TO THE STATES ACCORDING TO POPULATION IN ARTICLE I, SECTION 2, OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION. THIS IS THE SOLE CONSTITUTIONAL REASON FOR THE CENSUS--TO APPORTION THE SEATS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WHAT WE DID IN 1971 AND WILL DO IN 1981 IS, TECHNICALLY, REDISTRICTING THE STATE LEGISLATURE, NOT REAPPORTIONING IT. I DON'T EXPECT ANY ATTEMPT HERE TO CHANGE WHAT HAS BECOME COMMON USAGE, BUT THE DISTINCTION IS MEANINGFUL AND THE ELECTIONS COMMITTEE SHOULD UNDERSTAND IT.

NOT UNTIL BAKER V. CARR IN 1962 AND REYNOLDS V. SIMS IN 1964 WAS THE ONE MAN-ONE VOTE PRINCIPAL EXTENDED TO STATE

LEGISLATURES. THE 1970 CENSUS WAS THE FIRST, THEREFORE, THAT WAS USED BY ALL 50 STATES TO REDISTRICT LEGISLATURES. BECAUSE IT WAS THE FIRST, A NUMBER OF PROBLEMS AROSE, MANY OF WHICH WE THINK WILL BE ELIMINATED IN 1980. NOW, BACK TO SOME MORE DEFINITIONS.

THE ENUMERATION DISTRICT IS THE SMALLEST CENSUS UNIT OUTSIDE URBANIZED AREAS. WITHIN URBANIZED AREAS OF 25,000 OR MORE POPULATION, THE BLOCK IS THE SMALLEST UNIT. BLOCKS ARE COMBINED INTO CENSUS TRACTS IN THE URBAN AREAS. URBAN AREAS STILL HAVE ENUMERATION DISTRICTS. THERE ARE SEVERAL ENUMERATION DISTRICTS IN A CENSUS TRACT.

WE HAVE A MAP OF THE RENO AREA. THE YELLOW BOUNDARY IS THE LIMIT OF THE URBANIZED AREA. THAT WILL INCLUDE EVERYTHING WITHIN AN INCORPORATED CITY. THAT IS WHY, FOR INSTANCE, STEAD IS WITHIN THE YELLOW. IN ADDITION, THE URBANIZED AREA INCLUDES OTHER AREAS OF URBAN DENSITY WHETHER OR NOT IN AN INCORPORATED CITY. THERE WILL BE BLOCKS AND TRACTS WITHIN URBANIZED AREAS.

THE GREEN LINES OUTLINE THREE CENSUS TRACTS IN SOUTH CENTRAL RENO ALONG VIRGINIA. THE PINK LINES SHOW ENUMERATION DISTRICTS. IF YOU LOOKED CLOSELY, YOU COULD SEE SMALL NUMBERS WITHIN THE TRACTS AND ENUMERATION DISTRICTS. THESE ARE CENSUS BLOCKS.

FOR PURPOSES OF REDISTRICTING, THE ENUMERATION DISTRICT IS THE BASIC UNIT. THERE ARE AT LEAST TWO REASONS FOR THIS. THE ENUMERATION DISTRICT DATA IS THE ONLY DATA THAT WILL BE AVAILABLE IN TIME FOR OUR 1981 SESSION. IT WILL BE AVAILABLE IN HARD COPY AND ON COMPUTER TAPE. THE SECOND REASON FOR NOT GOING BELOW ENUMERATION DISTRICTS IS BECAUSE THAT IS THE SMALLEST UNIT USING ANY SORT OF VISIBLE BOUNDARIES SUCH AS STREETS, POWERLINES, STREAMS, ETC.

THE BUREAU OF THE CENSUS ESTABLISHES THE CRITERIA FOR ENUMERATION DISTRICTS. THE BASIS FOR AN ENUMERATION DISTRICT IS THE AREA THAT CAN REASONABLY BE COVERED BY A SINGLE ENUMERATOR. THE IDEAL SIZE IS ABOUT 600 PEOPLE. WITHIN URBAN AREAS, THE BUREAU HAS THE ASSISTANCE OF CENSUS AREA COMMITTEES MADE UP OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT PEOPLE LIKE PLANNERS, SCHOOL DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVES, BUSINESSES AND UNIVERSITIES.

UNTIL THIS TIME, OUTSIDE OF URBAN AREAS THE CENSUS DREW THE ED'S THEMSELVES. THE 1970 CENSUS HAD A NUMBER OF PROBLEMS IN TERMS OF REDISTRICTING. MOST OF THESE WERE RELATED TO THE WAY ED'S WERE DRAWN. SOME OF THEIR SHAPES CAUSED PROBLEMS. MINERAL COUNTY HAD ONE DONUT-SHAPED ED SURROUNDING THE SEVERAL HAWTHORNE ED'S.

IN THE URBAN AREAS, THE MOST COMMON DIFFICULTY CAME FROM SPLITTING ED'S GEOGRAPHICALLY BUT COUNTING THEM AS A SINGLE ED. THIS MEANT THE COMPUTER HAD TO PUT ALL OF THE PIECES OF AN ED INTO THE SAME PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE DISTRICT EVEN IF THEY WERE SEPARATED BY SOME DISTANCE, WHICH WAS COMMON. WE HAVE THE LAS VEGAS AREA ED MAP AS AN EXAMPLE. SOME CRITICS HAVE LOOKED AT OUR LEGISLATIVE DISTRICTS AND FOUND THEM STRANGE IN TERMS OF SHAPE. THIS IS MOSTLY BECAUSE THE ED'S THEMSELVES ARE STRANGELY SHAPED.

THE CENSUS RECOGNIZED THE PROBLEMS IN 1970. A NUMBER OF THINGS HAVE BEEN DONE TO IMPROVE THE 1980 CENSUS AND I'D LIKE TO COVER SOME OF THESE AND THEN TURN THE PRESENTATION OVER TO MR. DUGGER. MR. PALMER IS HERE TO ANSWER QUESTIONS YOU MIGHT HAVE.

CONGRESS HAS FORMALLY PROVIDED FOR STATE PARTICIPATION IN DRAWING CENSUS BOUNDARIES FOR THE 1980 CENSUS. ONE OPTION WAS FOR A STATE TO USE ELECTION PRECINCTS AS ED'S. WE DID NOT OPT FOR THIS IN NEVADA BECAUSE OF RAPID GROWTH. PRECINCTS WOULD HAD TO HAVE BEEN FROZEN IN 1976. WE DID DECIDE TO PARTICIPATE IN THE ED DESIGNATION PROGRAM. THE LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION ACCEPTED THIS RESPONSIBILITY AND THE RESEARCH DIVISION DID IT. THE ATLAS WE HAVE HERE CONTAINS THE PROPOSED ED'S OUTSIDE OF CLARK AND WASHOE FOR THE COMING CENSUS. WE FOLLOWED CENSUS CRITERIA BUT TRIED TO ALLOW MORE FLEXIBILITY FOR DISTRICTING BY STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS. WE HAVE DRAWN MORE ED'S AND HAVE TRIED TO GIVE THEM RATIONAL SHAPES AND IDENTIFIABLE BOUNDARIES.

WITHIN THE URBAN AREAS, THE CENSUS STATES THAT IT WILL NOT SPLIT ED'S AND THERE WILL BE AN ATTEMPT TO MAKE ED'S MORE COMPACT.

ED DATA SHOULD BE AVAILABLE STARTING IN AUGUST 1980 WITH SMALL STATES FIRST AND BE COMPLETE BY DECEMBER. THIS SHOULD ALLOW ADEQUATE TIME TO BE READY FOR THE 1981 SESSION.

MY CONCLUSION, BEFORE TURNING THIS OVER TO FRED DUGGER, IS THAT YOUR COMMITTEE CONSIDER A RESOLUTION DIRECTING AN INTERIM STUDY OF CENSUS METHODS AND PROCEDURES AND INTERIM PREPARATION FOR THE 1981 REDISTRICTING BY THE LEGISLATURE. SUCH AN INTERIM GROUP CAN REVIEW ALL THE NEEDS OF THE 1981 SESSION, PREPARE FOR MANY OF THEM AND PROVIDE POLICY GUIDANCE TO THE STAFF IN THEIR PREPARATION. BASED ON HIS EXPERIENCE IN 1971, MR. PALMER THINKS THIS WOULD BE WORTHWHILE. IF YOU LIKE, I'LL WORK UP SOME RESOLUTION LANGUAGE. ONE THING SUCH A GROUP COULD CONSIDER IS WHO WOULD DO THE COMPUTER WORK. WITH THAT, I'LL ASK FRED DUGGER TO DESCRIBE THE ROLE OF CDP AND THE COMPUTER IN THE 1971 REDISTRICTING.

SOME CENSUS TERMS
1980

Apportionment/Reapportionment - refers to the apportionment of the U.S. House of Representatives pursuant to Article I, section 2 of the U.S. Constitution.

Census Block - the smallest geographic Census unit in urbanized areas. This is usually a city block. In large cities with big apartment buildings, one block can contain several enumeration districts but ordinarily, there will be several blocks composing enumeration districts and Census tracts.

Census County Divisions - these are geographical divisions of counties by the Census to facilitate the taking of the Census. They are not used in Nevada.

Census Day - April 1, 1980.

Census Designated Place - these replace the unincorporated areas designation. These are unincorporated places designated by the states for separate counts. They have some significance to state or local governments. Our Highway department submitted CDP's for Nevada outside the urban areas.

Census Tracts - contain, usually, a number of blocks and two or more enumeration districts.

Districting/Redistricting - refers to state legislative districting as well as other types of substate districting.

Enumeration districts - the so-called basic building block of the Census. It is an area designed to be covered by one enumerator. Ideally, it is about 600 people. Outside urbanized areas, this is the smallest Census unit. Because of early availability and because they usually have recognizable boundaries, ED's are the basic tool of reapportionment/redistricting.

100 Percent Items - those Census questions addressed to every one. There are six demographic and eight housing questions.

Interdecennial Census - under a new law, starting in 1985, there will be interdecennial censuses. These are not intended for apportionment purposes nor will they be as elaborate as the decennial Census. Rather, they are to be head counts for use in revenue sharing and similar population-based programs.

Minor Civil Divisions - These are divisions of counties done by counties or states. In Nevada, these are the political townships for which we have justices of the peace and constables. The Census recognizes these townships as minor civil divisions.

Minority Statistics Program - a combination of efforts aimed at greater awareness of the Census and its importance among minorities and an improved count of minorities in 1980.

Sample Items - those Census questions addressed to only a part of the population. In governmental subdivisions of 5,000 or less, 50 percent will get the sample items. In larger areas, 15 percent will get the sample items. There are 25 socioeconomic items and 19 housing items on the sample questionnaire. Nationwide, about 21 percent of the population will get the sample items.

SELECTED KEY DATES FOR 1980
CENSUS PREPARATORY ACTIVITIES

With the 1978 dress rehearsal census program now underway, we have prepared a timetable covering a number of dates for key activities leading up to Census Day—April 1, 1980. It should be noted that some of these dates are subject to adjustment as we develop and integrate the more detailed calendar of census preparatory activities.

1. Transmit list of specific questions planned for 1980 census to the Congress (as required by title 13, U.S.C.)..... March 31, 1978
2. Census Day for dress rehearsal censuses in the Richmond, Virginia, area and La Plata and Montezuma Counties, Colorado..... April 4, 1978
3. Completion of publication specifications for 100-percent data*..... May 1, 1978
4. Census Day for dress rehearsal census in lower Manhattan, New York City..... September 12, 1978
5. Completion of publication specifications for sample data for "small" areas*..... October 15, 1978
6. 1980 census questionnaires to print..... January 1979

7. Completion of publication specifications for sample data for "large" areas (not including "subject report" series) March 15, 1979
8. Community Services Program fully staffed..... July 1979
9. Assemble and address questionnaire mailing pieces (80+ million)..... April 1979-
January 1980
10. Temporary field district offices (400+) opened.... January 1980
11. Review by local authorities of preenumeration housing unit counts (i.e., counts of mailing list addresses)..... January-
February 1980
12. Special field check of addresses in city areas (i.e., "precanvass")..... February-
March 1980
13. Questionnaire mailing pieces received by local post offices for predelivery address check..... March 6, 1980
14. Questionnaires delivered by postal carriers to all households..... March 28, 1980
15. Census Day..... April 1, 1980

In forthcoming issues of UPDATE, we will provide more information about this preenumeration calendar of events and information on post-census activities. In the meantime, readers may wish to consult previous UPDATE issues which described a number of the activities mentioned in this article.

*Specifications subject to revision based on final questionnaire content and dress rehearsal experience.

The 100-percent and sample items which will be included in 1980 are listed below:

100-PERCENT ITEMS

Population

Household relationship
Sex
Race
Age
Marital status
Spanish origin or descent

Housing

Number of units in structure
Complete plumbing facilities
Number of rooms
Tenure (whether the unit is owned or rented)
Cooperative/condominium identification
Value of home (for owner-occupied units and condominiums)
Rent (for renter-occupied units)
Vacant for rent, for sale, etc.; and period of vacancy

SAMPLE ITEMS

Population

School enrollment
Educational attainment
State of birth
Citizenship and year of immigration
Ancestry
Current language
Year moved into this house
Place of residence five years ago
Major activity five years ago
Veteran status
Presence of disability or handicap
Children ever born
Date of first marriage and whether terminated by death
Employment status
Hours worked last week
(for employed persons)
Place of work
Travel time to work
Means of transportation to work
Persons in carpool
Whether looking for work
(for unemployed persons)
Industry
Occupation
Class of worker
Time worked in 1979
Amount of income by source and total income in 1979

Housing

~~Stores~~
Stores in building and presence of elevator
Year built
On a city lot or place of less than 10 acres
Sale of crops
Source of water
Sewage disposal
Heating equipment
Fuels used for house heating, water heating, and cooking
Costs of utilities and fuels
Complete kitchen facilities
Number of bedrooms
Number of bathrooms
Existence of specific structural deficiencies or damage
Telephone
Air conditioning
Number of automobiles
Number of light trucks and vans
Homeowner shelter costs for mortgage, real estate taxes, and hazard insurance
Existence of property improvement loan