

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. Hickey

GUESTS PRESENT: Andrew P. Grose, Research Director, LCB
J. Ken Creighton, Research Analyst
Assemblyman Joe Dini
Assemblyman John Marvel
Judy DuBois, Clark County
Alan Beck, Humboldt County

Chairman Glover called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m. and informed the committee that the main purpose of this meeting was to discuss reapportionment in the rural counties. He then asked Mr. Grose to bring the committee up-to-date on the total reapportionment picture before explaining the rural county maps.

Mr. Andrew P. Grose, Research Director for the Legislative Counsel Bureau, advised the committee that the computer program was running well and they were now ready to incorporate various parameters into the different programs. He indicated that since last week's meeting a revision had been made on the first Senate plan resulting in better numbers and shapes. He added that by next week there will be more computer assisted products for urban areas available for perusal.

Mr. Grose then directed the committee's attention to the rural maps posted on the wall and said he would point out the general criteria used on each plan. Before discussing specific plans he felt the committee should be aware of some facts; namely, that 42 Assemblymen and 21 Senators, is mathematically best while maintaining present levels of representation in the rural counties. He noted that taking Carson City plus additional population from either Lyon, Storey or Washoe County constitutes one Senate district and two Assembly districts by itself which creates the problem of four incumbent senators in three districts and seven incumbent assemblymen in six districts; the only way to avoid this problem is by splitting Carson City.

In reviewing Assembly District Map #1, Mr. Grose indicated that this map was drawn according to this committee's suggestions but resulted in unacceptable disparities of plus fourteen and minus fifteen.

Indicating Map #2 and noting that it was a refinement of #1, he said that by taking Mr. Polish's district and adding Tonopah Township, Gabbs Township, some of Mineral County and a lot of territory but not much population of Churchill County, a district that is within a half a percent of ideal is formed; Mr. Redelsperger's district is close to ideal even though it is less in square miles; the Dini district is essentially the same as at present with a little less of Churchill County; Douglas County remains the same; Carson City takes about 4,000 people from Washoe Valley. He further indicated that in the northern district, Mr. Rhoads district, by adding Carlin Township and Eureka County a close to ideal district is formed but causes a problem in Mr. Marvel's district which is corrected by a later map.

In #3 he noted that the parameters were to split Mineral County rather than Churchill County which does not work.

Commenting on #4, Mr. Grose observed that this plan was probably the best, technically speaking, so far. He indicated that on this map Wadsworth is added to either Mr. Marvel or Mr. Rackley's district; Mr. Polish's district is adjusted either up or down; the Rhoads district stays the same; Redelsperger is still in Fallon; Storey County is taken from Mr. Dini's district and added to Carson City; some population is taken from Churchill County and added to the Dini district. He noted that all the numbers are good on this plan.

In answer to a question from Mr. Sader, Mr. Grose stated that there are approximately 14,000 people in Churchill County of which 11 to 12 thousand reside in Fallon including the agricultural area to the south and the air base but that none of these plans split the city of Fallon.

Mr. Grose said that because Senate plan #3 is a companion to Assembly plan #5, he would discuss the Senate plan first. He indicated that the request for this map was to look at a north-south pattern for Senate districts. He noted that with this criteria both the Senate and Assembly plans look good numerically but cause some problems with incumbents, such as Senator Glaser and Senator Blakemore in the same district; Mr. Polish and Mr. Redelsperger in the same district; Mr. Marvel and Mr. Rackley in the same district; and no Assemblyman in one district.

On Assembly Map #6 he pointed out that the adjacent part of Lyon County is attached to Carson City; fewer people are taken out of Washoe Valley for Carson City; more people are taken from Churchill County and added to the Dini district. He noted that there are several enumeration districts in this area that can be used for adjustment purposes. **124**

In response to a suggestion from the Rural Caucus which met last week, Mr. Grose indicated that plan #7 was drawn taking part of Clark County and adding that to the rural area. He pointed out that Clark County has about 6,000 more in population than is needed for the seats designated in a 42-21 legislature; this map moves 5,000 people from Clark County to Mr. Polish's district; Mr. Redelsperger would take more of Churchill County. He added that in both #6 and #7 while Mr. Polish has Tonopah Township, the town of Tonopah (2,000 persons) is in Mr. Redelsperger's district.

He continued by saying that plan #8 takes population from the other side of Clark County, the Pahrump side.

Mr. Glover commented that at the Rural Caucus it was felt that in a sense of fairness, plans should be tried taking some population from Clark County. Mr. Sader added that Washoe County was losing some population.

When Mr. Sader asked if there was any concensus of opinion at the Rural Caucus as to which plan was best, Mr. Grose replied that the caucus had only seen five of the plans and of those five, number four was optimum.

Assemblyman Joe Dini pointed out that part of his district which is mostly agriculture with citizen farmers with common interests. He added that it was very difficult to meet the people in these areas and that Churchill County was upset with being split. He felt that an attempt should be made to keep those with the same community interests together.

Mr. Glover asked Mr. Dini, since either Dayton or Virginia City must be moved to the Carson City district, which of these might have the most in common with Carson City. Mr. Dini replied that he did not think it mattered but that most of his democratic population was north of the Carson River.

When Mr. Glover asked Mr. Sader what effect taking Wadsworth out of Washoe County had on his plan, he answered that their plan was designed so that losing either Wadsworth or Gerlach would have no effect.

When Mr. Dini asked if Wadsworth Township included Pyramid Lake, Mr. Sader answered yes with most of the population in the three communities of Sutcliff, Nixon and Wadsworth. He added that the population of Wadsworth Township was 1,012 and of Gerlach was 583.

Going on to the Senate Maps, Mr. Grose indicated that Senate #1 was a version of Assembly #1. He noted that taking the present northern district and adding Pershing County and Gerlach Township is over 5% below what is needed which is why on most of these maps Wadsworth Township has been added to the northern district. **125**
He pointed out that adding 4,000 from Washoe Valley to Carson City is not enough.

Continuing Mr. Grose noted that #2 is an attempt to fix the problems with #1 by adding Wadsworth Township to the northern district.

Since Map 3# had already been discussed, he went on to #4 which emanates from the Assembly plan #6. He said that this map takes some Dayton rather than Washoe population for Carson City.

Mr. Grose said that #5 was the result of a Senate Government Affairs suggestion which tilts the other plans at a 45 degree angle to the right. He noted that the numbers work well but there is still an incumbency problem with Senators Getto and Blakemore. He indicated a change in one district encompassing Douglas, Lyon and Storey Counties plus Mineral County rather than part of Churchill.

When Mr. Glover asked how the Assembly districts will work on Senate map #5, Mr. Grose replied that that had not yet been drawn, but he was not optimistic. He commented that there is not the flexibility in the rural areas that there is in the urban areas.

When Alan Beck from Humboldt County asked if these maps were available to the public, Mr. Grose responded that base maps were available for anyone to draw their own lines on but it was impossible time and cost wise for them to reproduce these maps.

Mr. Beck then commented that on Senate #5 going from the upper left hand corner of Washoe County into White Pine County was out of the question because of the miles involved.

Mr. Dini pointed out that there was no community interest between White Pine and Elko County and Mr. Glover mentioned the difference of interest in Pershing County and Nye County in regard to agriculture and mining.

When Mr. Glover asked how the Clark County committee people felt about taking some population from there for the rural areas, Mr. Malone said that thought should be given to the fact that the inner city districts must expand and take population of the outer city and county.

When Judy DuBois from Clark County asked if on #6 city limits of Blue Diamond and Good Springs were used as boundaries, Mr. Grose explained that it was the Good Springs Township, the Searchlight Township and an enumeration district that is the west part of the Law Vegas Township excluding Indian Springs.

When Mr. Chaney reiterated Mr. Malone's comments about the necessary expansion of city districts, Mr. Grose advised that the existing districts that are adjacent to the border areas are excess population districts. He noted that by next week they would have the initial maps drawn indicating proposed redistricting of Clark County.

When Mrs. Hayes asked if taking some of the Enterprise Township and incorporating it into the Redelsperger district had been tried, Mr. Grose answered no that they had not been looking for additional population in that area but, if needed, that would make sense.

Since there was no further discussion on reapportionment in rural counties, Mr. Glover directed attention to AB 164.

AB 164: Specifies time for commencing reports of campaign contributions.

Mr. Glover distributed proposed amendments to AB 164 which are attached to these minutes as EXHIBIT A. He explained that the amendments add the reporting of expenditures within the same time frame as contributions.

When Mrs. Hayes asked if contributions would include being taken to dinner by a constituent, both Mr. Glover and Mr. Sader answered no that it must be for a campaign and not personal.

Mr. Malone moved to adopt the amendment (EXHIBIT A), seconded by Mr. Sader and unanimously carried by the members present with Mr. Hickey absent.

Mr. Malone moved DO PASS AS AMENDED on AB 164, seconded by Mr. Sader and carried by a vote of 9 to 1 with Mr. Chaney voting no and with Mr. Hickey absent.

Mr. Glover said he would ask Mr. Rusk, the sponsor of the bill, to speak on the floor.

Mr. Robinson commented that AB 164 addressed contributions of an incumbent candidate but questioned whether a non-incumbent would be required to report contributions and under what time frame.

In discussion the committee questioned whether, for example, an assemblyman who decided to run for the senate would be covered by this bill; whether telephone calls, letters and newsletters were to be considered expenditures.

In light of the preceding unanswered questions and the need of legal opinion, Mr. Beyer moved to RESCIND THE PREVIOUS MOTION, seconded by Mrs. Hayes and carried by a vote of 9 to 1 with Mr. Prengaman voting no and Mr. Hickey absent.

Mr. Glover said that he would seek legal advice and have some amendments drawn for future committee discussion.

Since there was no further business, Mr. Glover adjourned the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia Hatch

Patricia Hatch, Secretary

1981 REGULAR SESSION (61st)

ASSEMBLY ACTION		SENATE ACTION		Assembly	AMENDMENT BLANK
Adopted <input type="checkbox"/>		Adopted <input type="checkbox"/>		AMENDMENTS to	Assembly
Lost <input type="checkbox"/>		Lost <input type="checkbox"/>		Bill No.	164
Date: <input type="checkbox"/>		Date: <input type="checkbox"/>		BDR	24-618
Initial: <input type="checkbox"/>		Initial: <input type="checkbox"/>		Proposed by	Committee on Elections
Concurred in <input type="checkbox"/>		Concurred in <input type="checkbox"/>			
Not concurred in <input type="checkbox"/>		Not concurred in <input type="checkbox"/>			
Date: <input type="checkbox"/>		Date: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Initial: <input type="checkbox"/>		Initial: <input type="checkbox"/>			

Amendment N^o 387



Amend the bill as a whole by adding two new sections designated sections 2 and 3, following section 1, to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. NRS 294A.020 is hereby amended to read as follows:

294A.020

1. Every candidate for state, district, county, city or township office at a recall, special, primary or general election shall, not later than:

(a) Fifteen days after the primary election if the candidate wins or 30 days after the primary election if he loses, for the remaining period up to the primary election; period from the day of the last

preceding general election to the primary election or, if the candidate holds any office for which reporting of expenses is required, the period from the day of his election to that office to the primary election;

(b) Fifteen days before the general election, for the period from the primary election up to 20 days before the general election; and

(c) Thirty days after the general election, for the remaining period up to the general election, report his campaign expenses on affidavit forms to be designed and provided by the secretary of state.

2. Reports of campaign expenses must be filed with the officer with whom he filed his declaration of candidacy or acceptance of candidacy. A candidate may mail his report to that officer by certified mail. If certified mail is used, the date of mailing shall be deemed the date of filing.

3. County clerks who receive from candidates for legislative or judicial office reports of campaign expenses pursuant to subsection 2 shall file a copy of each report with the secretary of state.

4. Any candidate who willfully violates any of the provisions of this section is guilty of a gross misdemeanor.

Sec. 3. NRS 293.031 is hereby amended to read as follows:

293.031 "Campaign expenses" means all expenditures contracted for or made for advertising on television, radio, billboards, posters and in newspapers, and all other expenditures contracted for or made to further directly the candidate's campaign for election [of the candidate during the periods:

To: E & E
LCB File
Journal
Engrossment
Bill

Drafted by DS:m1 Date 3-11-81 128

1. Between the first day on which a certificate of candidacy may be filed and the primary election; and
 2. Between the primary election and the general election.]".
- Amend the title of the bill on the first line by deleting:
"contributions;" and inserting "contributions and expenses;".

ASSEMBLY

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

Date TUES., MARCH 31 Time 3:00 p.m. Room 200.....

Bills or Resolutions
to be considered

Subject

Counsel
requested*

DISCUSSION OF REAPPORTIONMENT IN SMALL COUNTIES

*Please do not ask for counsel unless necessary.