

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Glover
Vice Chairman Chaney
Mr. Beyer
Mrs. Ham
Mrs. Hayes
Mr. Hickey
Mr. Malone
Mr. Nicholas
Mr. Prengaman
Mr. Sader

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. Robinson (excused)

GUESTS PRESENT: William Swackhamer, Secretary of State
Steve Pozzi, Sergeant-at-Arms
Bill Curran, Clark County District Attorney's Office
John Whisenhunt, Clark Co. District Attorney's Office

Chairman Glover called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. in Room 200.

Mr. Hickey asked that a memorandum that he had received from Samuel Hohmann, Senior Research Analyst, regarding congressional campaign expenditure differences between urban and rural districts be included in the minutes for the committee's information. This memorandum including four tables is attached to these minutes as EXHIBIT A (pages 1 through 7).

SB 90: Repeals obsolete reference to certification of nomination.

Mr. William Swackhamer, Secretary of State, indicated that this section of the law was now obsolete because it referred to certificate of candidacy which is no longer required for United States Senate and because 304.020 refers to paper ballots which are no longer used.

SB 91: Changing distribution of candidates' filing fees.

Mr. William Swackhamer, Secretary of State, stated that SB 91 proposes to remove the provision in the law which requires his office to distribute to the counties the filing fees collected by his office on the basis of the number votes cast in the county. He noted the cost of sending out seventeen small checks to the various counties and the fact that the state pays for all punch card ballots statewide. He said that not distributing the filing fees but paying for the ballots was a tradeoff.

Mrs. Hayes asked if there had been any consideration given to raising the filing fees because they certainly would not cover the cost of time and materials expended in his office for the filing of candidates. Mr. Swackhamer explained that he had not received any such suggestion and indicated that he felt that easy ballot access through low filing fees reduced the chance of legislation to allow write-in votes.

Mrs. Ham asked if the filing fees formerly went to the state General Fund or to the counties, and Mr. Swackhamer replied that the county clerk or registrar of voters collected the filing fees for their county.

SB 95: Removes conflicting statutory language respecting location of certain precinct meetings.

Mr. Glover pointed out that this was probably a bill drafting error in the original language and said he would inquire as to the reason for this change.

SB 105: Creates new filing requirements for initiative and referendum petitions.

Mr. William Swackhamer, Secretary of State, stated that the sole purpose of this bill was to establish the procedure for filing an initiative or referendum petition with his office before circulation among the populace. He added that with this requirement his office would be able to make the text of a petition available to the public for study during the signature process.

Since there was no further business, Chairman Glover adjourned the meeting at 3:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Patricia Hatch
Secretary

STATE OF NEVADA
LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU

LEGISLATIVE BUILDING
CAPITOL COMPLEX
CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89710



EXHIBIT A

LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION (702) 885-5627

KEITH ASHWORTH, *Senator, Chairman*
Arthur J. Palmer, *Director, Secretary*

INTERIM FINANCE COMMITTEE (702) 885-5640

DONALD R. MELLO, *Assemblyman, Chairman*
Ronald W. Sparks, *Senate Fiscal Analyst*
William A. Bible, *Assembly Fiscal Analyst*

ARTHUR J. PALMER, *Director*
(702) 885-5627

FRANK W. DAYKIN, *Legislative Counsel* (702) 885-5627
JOHN R. CROSSLEY, *Legislative Auditor* (702) 885-5620
ANDREW P. GROSE, *Research Director* (702) 885-5637

February 13, 1981

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Assemblyman Thomas J. Hickey
FROM: Samuel F. Hohmann, *Sam* Senior Research Analyst
SUBJECT: Congressional Campaign Expenditures

This memorandum is in response to your request for information regarding congressional campaign expenditure differences between urban (small area) districts and rural (large area) districts. The results of the analysis given below suggest that campaign expenditures are not related to district area.

ANALYSIS

Table I is a listing of 1978 congressional elections campaign expenditures, and district area for 71 congressional districts in nine western states that have more than one congressional district. The data was obtained from Politics in the West: The 1978 Elections edited by B. Oliver Walter, The Institute for Policy Research, University of Wyoming, Laramie.

Because there are many factors in an election campaign which may influence campaign expenditures, for example, incumbency, the data was separated into groups. The groups were based on the percentage of the vote which the winner received. Selection of this common denominator is based on the discussion in "Campaign Spending and the Electoral Process in California, 1966-1974," by John R. Owens and Edward C. Olson in The Western Political Quarterly 30 (4): 493-511, December 1977. Three groups were specified: close elections in which the winner received less than 54 percent of the vote; intermediate contests, 55 to 64 percent; and landslides, 65 percent or more. Two of the districts (California's 28th and Montana's 1st) were eliminated because of unusual circumstances influencing the campaigns.

Page 2

Campaign expenditures and district areas for 69 congressional districts were analyzed with the following results:

1. A negative correlation was found between campaign expenditures and district area in elections where the winner received less than 54 percent of the vote; that is, larger campaign expenditures were generally observed in smaller area congressional districts than larger ones in close elections. This data is presented in Table II.
2. A positive correlation was found between campaign expenditures and district area in elections where the winner received between 55 and 64 percent of the vote; that is, larger campaign expenditures were generally associated with larger area congressional districts in elections won by at least a 10 percent margin. The data is presented in Table III.
3. A zero correlation was found between campaign expenditures and district area in elections where the winner received between 65 and 100 percent of the vote; that is, no relationship was found between campaign expenditures and district area in landslide elections. The data is presented in Table IV.

CONCLUSIONS

Because the correlations in the three groups are divergent, a clear trend in the data is not apparent. Moreover, when the data were lumped together, there is no significant correlation between campaign expenses and district area.

I hope this information is helpful. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

SFH/jld
Enclosures

TABLE I.

1978 CONGRESSIONAL ELECTIONS CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES
AND DISTRICT AREA FOR 71 CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS
IN NINE WESTERN STATES

DISTRICT	EXPENDITURE	AREA (Sq. Mi.)	DISTRICT	EXPENDITURE	AREA (Sq. Mi.)
Arizona			California		
1	\$ 207,483	1,373	38	\$ 195,876	402
2	428,979	22,249	39	208,323	523
3	198,085	53,493	40	56,901	170
4	201,682	36,303	41	145,151	196
			42	89,736	852
			43	98,583	14,425
California			Colorado		
1	36,877	11,754	1	266,140	95
2	281,361	34,888	2	951,336	1,531
3	797,436	155	3	202,823	50,281
4	373,685	5,953	4	253,362	39,751
5	88,923	26	5	268,716	12,108
6	96,933	539			
7	123,190	103	Idaho		
8	83,878	542	1	390,864	30,458
9	31,931	302	2	433,159	52,219
10	56,864	1,061			
11	66,817	157	Montana		
12	110,347	6,414	1	419,424	56,027
13	231,369	3,785	2	313,882	98,553
14	492,062	626			
15	370,258	2,718	New Mexico		
16	403,526	7,375	1	171,128	40,606
17	407,351	384	2	69,953	80,606
18	308,814	26,901			
19	109,086	84	Oregon		
20	351,426	104	1	534,032	6,515
21	266,851	47	2	55,401	70,031
22	69,739	81	3	38,318	395
23	56,946	89	4	385,563	19,243
24	74,419	2,718			
25	41,232	165	Utah		
26	54,386	64	1	303,659	43,591
27	599,779	422	2	584,280	38,505
28	231,444	151			
29	20,489	62	Washington		
30	149,657	40	1	185,520	149
31	139,728	57	2	474,880	7,201
32	109,228	94	3	95,277	14,156
33	271,671	19,887	4	197,561	22,588
34	598,508	68	5	540,692	21,556
35	299,871	104	6	186,039	751
36	51,093	11,823	7	738,514	170
37	169,448	50			

TABLE II.

CONGRESSIONAL CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES
AND DISTRICT AREAS IN CLOSE ELECTIONS

Correlation Coefficient R = -0.65

DISTRICT	EXPENDITURES	AREA (Sq. Mi.)	WINNER'S % OF VOTE
Arizona			
2	\$ 428,979	22,249	53
California			
2	281,361	34,888	52
3	797,436	155	53
14	492,062	626	53
17	407,351	384	54
27	599,779	422	51
34	598,508	68	54
35	299,871	104	54
Colorado			
2	951,336	1,531	53
3	202,823	50,281	49
Utah			
1	303,659	43,591	51
Washington			
2	474,880	7,201	51
5	540,692	21,556	48
7	738,514	170	53

Research Division
SFH/2/13/81

TABLE III.

CONGRESSIONAL CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES
AND DISTRICT AREAS IN MODERATE ELECTIONS

Correlation Coefficient R = 0.35

DISTRICT	EXPENDITURES	AREA (Sq. Mi.)	WINNER'S % OF VOTE
Arizona			
4	201,682	36,303	63
California			
1	36,877	11,754	59
4	373,685	5,953	55
7	123,190	103	63
8	83,878	542	57
11	66,817	157	60
13	231,369	3,785	58
15	370,258	2,718	60
16	403,526	7,375	61
18	308,814	26,901	59
21	266,851	47	60
22	69,739	81	64
24	74,419	2,718	63
33	271,671	19,887	56
36	51,093	11,823	63
37	169,448	50	61
38	195,876	402	59
39	208,323	523	64
41	145,151	196	58
Colorado			
1	266,140	95	61
4	253,362	39,751	61
5	268,716	12,108	60
Idaho			
1	390,864	30,458	60
2	433,159	52,219	57
Montana			
2	313,882	98,553	57
New Mexico			
1	171,128	40,606	63

TABLE III. (Continued)
 CONGRESSIONAL CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES
 AND DISTRICT AREAS IN MODERATE ELECTIONS

DISTRICT	EXPENDITURES	AREA (Sq. Mi.)	WINNER'S % OF VOTE
Oregon			
1	534,032	6,515	63
4	385,563	19,243	56
Utah			
2	584,280	38,505	62
Washington			
1	185,520	149	64
3	95,277	14,156	59
4	197,561	22,588	61
6	186,039	751	61

Research Division
 SFH/2/13/81

TABLE IV.

CONGRESSIONAL CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES
AND DISTRICT AREAS IN LANDSLIDES

Correlation Coefficient R = 0.02

DISTRICT	EXPENDITURES	AREA (Sq. Mi.)	WINNER'S % OF VOTE
Arizona			
1	207,483	1,373	71
3	198,085	53,493	85
California			
5	88,923	26	67
6	96,933	539	68
9	31,931	302	65
10	56,864	1,061	72
12	110,347	6,414	73
19	109,086	84	72
20	351,426	104	66
23	56,946	89	66
25	41,232	165	68
26	54,386	64	100
29	20,489	62	85
30	149,657	40	71
31	139,728	57	68
32	109,228	94	72
40	56,901	170	66
42	89,736	852	74
43	98,583	14,425	69
New Mexico			
2	69,953	80,606	100
Oregon			
2	55,401	70,031	69
3	38,318	395	85

Research Division
SFH/2/13/81

ASSEMBLY

AGENDA FOR COMMITTEE ON..... ELECTIONS.....

Date MONDAY, FEB. 16 Time 3:00 p.m. Room 200.....

Bills or Resolutions to be considered	Subject	Counsel requested*
SB 90	Repeals obsolete reference to certification of nomination.	
SB 91	Changing distribution of candidates' filing fees.	
SB 95	Removes conflicting statutory language respecting location of certain precinct meetings.	
SB 105	Creates new filing requirements for initiative and referendum petitions.	

*Please do not ask for counsel unless necessary.