

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Glover  
Mr. Beyer (late)  
Mrs. Ham  
Mrs. Hayes (late)  
Mr. Hickey  
Mr. Malone  
Mr. Nicholas (late)  
Mr. Prengaman  
Mr. Robinson (late)  
Mr. Sader

MEMBERS ABSENT: Vice-Chairman Chaney

GUESTS PRESENT: Mr. Andrew P. Grose, Research Director  
Mr. J. Ken Creighton, Research Analyst

Chairman Glover called the meeting to order at 1:32 p.m. in Room 200. He asked for a committee introduction of BDR 24-929.\* Mr. Hickey moved for a committee introduction of this bill, seconded by Mr. Malone and unanimously carried by the members present.

Mr. Glover appointed two subcommittees, Mr. Hickey for Clark County and Mr. Sader for Washoe county, to work with their respective county delegations on reapportionment mainly as to where the lines should be drawn.

Mr. Glover then appointed Mr. Sader chairman of the subcommittee formed to work with the Senate Government Affairs subcommittee on election laws.

SCR 1: Adds joint rule limiting research, bill drafting and introduction of bills on reapportionment to certain committees.

Mr. Andrew P. Grose, Research Director, called attention to the memo attached to the minutes of January 27 as EXHIBIT J which lists the services and resources available to all legislators describing a weekly newsletter, maps and other research materials. He explained that staff needed guidance as to what work would be done by the computer because each run of the computer would cost approximately \$100. He added that if each request for computer work came from either the Elections Committee or the Senate Government Affairs Committee there would be some consolidation of requests and policy direction on the order in which computer work is done. He said that this is what SCR 1 asks for.

Mr. Nicholas said that he had some reservations concerning this resolution because he felt that a minority of the committee might have some difficulty having an impact, and since his district was one of those that could be greatly affected by reapportionment, he felt that he must reserve judgment until some of the

comments and directions had been generally adapted. He added that for these reasons he did not want to limit the presentations to those made strictly by the majority of the committee.

Mr. Hickey commented that he did not see this as a problem and if SCR 1 were not implemented, it would fall upon Mr. Grose to make the decision of priorities which would put him in a bad spot and that these decisions should really be made by legislators. He added that he felt that all legislators would work together for the good of the whole state not just for their own districts or parties.

After some discussion of SCR 1 being too restrictive the committee discovered that this bill had been amended in the Senate Government Affairs Committee but the first reprint had not come from the printing office as yet.

Chairman Glover read the amended version of SCR 1 to the committee:

"The Committee on Government Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Elections of the Assembly are respectively responsible for measures which primarily affect designation of districts from which members are elected to the legislature. Any request for research concerning the population of proposed districts must be submitted to the Research Division of the Legislative Counsel Bureau through one of these committees."

Most of the committee agreed that this amended version removed their concerns of restriction, did not preclude the asking of localized questions and allowed for more speed and efficiency. Mr. Prengaman moved for adoption of SCR 1 AS AMENDED, seconded by Mrs. Hayes and carried by a 9 to 1 vote with Mr. Nicholas voting no and Mr. Chaney absent.

Chairman Glover proceeded to the next item on the agenda, Reapportionment Policy Questions, a copy of which is attached to these minutes as EXHIBIT A. He asked the committee to comment on their feelings as to the size of each house.

When Mr. Sader asked if the senate committee had dealt with these questions as yet, Mr. Glover answered that he did not think so.

Mr. Hickey suggested that the committee begin with the present number of forty as a basic concept. Chairman Glover said that he would prefer to begin with 21 and 42 as a base figure which he felt would protect Washoe and the small counties while increasing representation for Clark County.

Dr. Robinson said that since he was dedicated to reducing the size and cost of government nationally as well as statewide as mandated by the people, he did not feel it was right for the legislature to be increasing its cost or size. He noted that for each legislator added there must be more secretaries, more office space and more

travel expenses, etc. He felt that the present level should be held and that the lines could be moved around to protect the smaller counties.

When Mr. Prengaman asked if there were any figures available pertaining to cost per legislator, Mr. Grose responded that three members could be added at a cost of \$46,000 total in the biennium. He added that the assumptions were that with shuffling there is enough office space, that no added secretarial help would be needed as this is controlled by the number of committees which would not change, and that in the interim there would not be more travel and per diem but the work would be spread over more legislators with the same amount of travel and per diem.

When Mr. Hickey asked if there were more problems with one size rather than another, Mr. Grose answered that mathematically no but from the practical and political point of view with 21 and 42 it was easier to adhere to existing county lines.

Dr. Robinson commented that the addition of three legislators was a five percent increase which would result in a five percent increase in all services such as bill drafting and research as well as more interim travel and larger memberships in national organizations. He added that he did not feel that the \$46,000 was a realistic figure, that a more practical approach would be to take the entire cost of running the legislature and divide by sixty people.

When Mr. Prengaman asked what impact the increase to 42 Assemblymen would have on the rural areas, Mr. Grose referred to EXHIBIT F of the January 27th minutes, Ideal District Sizes for Different Sizes of the Assembly and Distribution. He pointed out that for 42 seats the ideal district size is slightly over 19,000 which would allow allocation of eight percent to the rural counties which include Carson and Douglas in this context. Mr. Prengaman then asked if there were any other states which had increased or were discussing increasing the sizes of their houses. Mr. Grose replied that the trend was in the opposite direction but that this trend was in states with large legislatures such as Illinois which cut their legislature of 200 members by one-third. He added that he did not feel there was a trend one way or another in small legislatures.

Mrs. Hayes commented that the majority of the people are in favor of less government and that the committee should mainly consider what is best for the whole State of Nevada.

Mr. Glover noted that if there were only two senators representing fourteen counties, it would be almost impossible for these senators to visit their entire constituency.

Mr. Hickey moved that the committee consider the concepts of 40, 42 and 44 members of the Assembly initially, seconded by Mr. Nicholas and unanimously carried by the members present.

When Chairman Glover asked for comments on item #2, single member, multi-member or mixed, Mrs. Hayes suggested that the committee submit a bill changing the Assembly term to four years which would probably mean mixed districts. She noted how expensive it was becoming to run for an office which pays about \$2,000 per year.

Mr. Hickey moved that a bill be drafted which would change an Assembly term to four years and a Senate term to six years, seconded by Mrs. Hayes, and unanimously carried by members present with Mr. Chaney absent.

When Dr. Robinson commented that he felt the first step was to gain senate concurrence with this proposal, Mr. Glover reminded everyone that this would be a constitutional amendment and would not become law before five years at the least which meant that the committee must deal with reapportionment now with the present system of terms.

Mr. Nicholas said that he thought public hearings in areas where county lines may be crossed was an excellent idea, but he felt strongly that county lines should be followed where at all possible..

Mr. Glover reminded the committee of the problems of printing ballots where city and county lines were crossed.

When Mr. Glover directed the committee's attention to congressional seats, Mr. Hickey said that he preferred two districts rather than a statewide district with two representatives.

Mr. Glover said that he hoped that Congressman Santini would come and speak to the committee and give his views on this matter.

Mr. Prengaman noted that although constitutionally a congressman did not have to reside in his district, people tended to want to elect their representative from their own district.

Chairman Glover asked Mr. Grose to find out for the committee how many congressmen do actually live outside their districts.

When Mr. Glover asked the committee for comments on districting of university regents and the State Board of Education, Mr. Grose noted that something must be done to straighten out the existing statute if nothing else. For example, he said that the statutes require that in Clark County seats A through E are made up of assembly district such and such plus enumeration district such and such. He added that legislative redistricting must be done first.

Mr. Glover announced that the next meeting would be on Tuesday, February 10th at which time the committee would discuss AJR 13, AB 74 and AB 75.

Since there was no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Patricia Hatch  
Secretary

61st SESSION NEVADA LEGISLATURE

ASSEMBLY ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

LEGISLATION ACTION

DATE February 2, 1981

SUBJECT SCR 1: Adds joint rule limiting research, bill drafting and introduction of bills on reapportionment to certain committees.

MOTION: DO PASS AS AMENDED

Do Pass X Amend Indefinitely Postpone Reconsider

Moved By Mr. Prengaman Seconded By Mrs. Hayes

AMENDMENT:

Moved By Seconded By

AMENDMENT:

Moved By Seconded By

Table with columns: MOTION (Yes/No), AMEND (Yes/No), AMEND (Yes/No). Rows include names: BEYER, CHANEY, HAM, HAYES, HICKEY, MALONE, NICHOLAS, PRENGAMAN, ROBINSON, SADER, GLOVER, and TALLY (9/1).

ORIGINAL MOTION: Passed X Defeated Withdrawn

AMENDED & PASSED AMENDED & DEFEATED

AMENDED & PASSED AMENDED & DEFEATED

Attached to Minutes February 2, 1981

REAPPORTIONMENT POLICY QUESTIONS

The following questions must be considered and preliminary answers given prior to the first attempts to draw maps.

A. State Legislature

1. Size of each house?  
(Maximum of 75 with senate at least 1/3rd of the assembly but no more than 1/2 the assembly.)
2. Single member, multi-member or mixed?
3. If the assembly is divisible evenly by the senate, should pairs of assembly districts be coterminous with a senate district?
4. Priority of political boundaries. Should county lines be adhered to and, if that is not possible, township lines?
5. Should population equality be tried prior to political boundary adherence, or vice versa?
6. Other considerations.

B. Congressional Seats

1. Greater Las Vegas and the rest of the state?
2. A split of Clark County so each district is statewide in character?
3. Other considerations.

C. Other Redistricting

1. Should university regents' districting be maintained along current lines? (Single member)
2. Should the state board of education districting be maintained along current lines? (Single member)

ASSEMBLY

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

Date MONDAY, FEB. 2nd Time 1:30 p.m. Room 200.....

Bills or Resolutions  
to be considered

Subject

Counsel  
requested\*

SCR 1

Adds joint rule limiting research, bill drafting and introduction of bills on reapportionment to certain committees.

Discussion of reapportionment policy questions.