

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: Mr. Andrew P. Grose, Research Director, LCB

Chairman Glover called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m. in room 200. He asked Mr. Grose to bring the committee up to date on reapportionment.

Mr. Andrew P. Grose, Research Director, Legislative Counsel Bureau, indicated that there are several areas where there is no agreement, some areas of outright conflict, but more areas of general agreement. He said that in the rural areas there is no concensus of opinion, but that the rural caucus is meeting tomorrow afternoon to try and reach agreement. He noted that none of the eleven Assembly plans or nine Senate plans is ideal but a concensus on the lesser of the evils must be reached.

Mr. Grose said that in Clark County the question of Moapa is still up in the air and no decision has been made on Assembly Districts #21 and 22. He indicated that there was general agreement that Wadsworth, Gerlach and the eastern part of the Washoe Valley should be attached to the rural areas.

Chairman Glover said that he felt it was time that the committee go on record with their preference of Congressional districting plans.

Mr. Chaney moved to accept the Congressional districting plan wherein Clark County minus three Assembly districts constitutes one Congressional district, and the balance of the state, including the three Assembly districts from Clark County, constitutes a second Congressional district, seconded by Mr. Nicholas.

Mr. Hickey said that he felt that splitting Washoe and Clark Counties would be the fairest division because it would eliminate the need of taking 60,000 residents out of Clark County. He, felt that a north-south division will preclude representation of the rural counties.

Date: April 28, 1981

Page: TWO

Mr. Sader informed the committee that a poll of all ten Washoe delegates indicated that they were all in favor of Mr. Chaney's motion for Congressional districting.

Mr. Hickey indicated that a poll of the Clark County delegation showed 13 in favor and 9 opposed to Mr. Chaney's motion.

Mr. Glover said that the small county delegation were 100 percent in favor of Mr. Chaney's motion.

Mr. Chaney's motion carried by an 8 to 2 vote with Mr. Hickey and Mrs. Hayes voting no and with Mr. Robinson absent.

Mr. Glover said that the next very important problem was the decision as to which three Assembly districts would be taken out of Clark County and included with the balance of the state. He noted that these three could be on the east or west side of the valley or from the North Las Vegas area.

When Mr. Sader asked how much population was needed, Mr. Grose answered that approximately 57,000 people were needed which would be three Assembly districts; that taking 57,000 out of Clark County leaves Clark County with 404,000; and with a one percent deviation allowed on Congressional districts, it would mean a leeway of 8,000. He added that these three districts must be contiguous.

Mr. Hickey outlined on the map his proposal for these three Assembly districts and then made the motion to attach Assembly Districts #1, #5 and #24 to the rest of the state which would encompass Mr. Kovacs' district, Mr. Brady's district and one new district. He explained that #1 is a more rural area, #5 a more conservative area and #24 is a developing area.

Mr. Sader seconded the motion.

Mr. Malone suggested taking districts #17, #20 and #14 which are presently the districts of Mr. Price, Mr. Craddock and Mr. Stewart.

Mr. Grose commented that this would require attaching Moapa to #17 for contiguity with the rest of the state. He noted that the eleven rural plans include taking some population out of Clark County and that Moapa is the most logical. He added that Moapa is tentatively attached to #1.

Mr. Prengaman felt that rather than try and wrap around the city, population should be taken from three districts that are close together towards the north.

Mr. Hickey said that he thought the three districts that he had proposed were the most compatible and congenial with the balance of the state.

Mr. Nicholas commented that eight months ago he surveyed Las Vegas to determine the areas of growth. He noted that the regional planning figures of a year ago indicated that the area around the air force base and beyond was the fastest growing area. He said that dividing Las Vegas on a north south line the east side is growing twice as fast as the west. He added that if Las Vegas is blocked to vigorously in terms of future growth areas, it could stilt that growth.

Mr. Hickey said that the future projection of growth is towards Tonopah and North Las Vegas. He commented that some type of MX is coming to Nevada and would impact this area even if greatly reduced in size.

Mr. Hickey moved the question that Assembly districts 1, 5 and 24 be taken from Clark County and be included with the balance of the state. The motion died for lack of a majority with Mr. Chaney, Mr. Glover, Mr. Hickey, Mrs. Hayes and Mr. Sader voting yes and Mr. Nicholas, Mr. Malone, Mr. Beyer, Mr. Prengaman and Mrs. Ham voting no.

Mr. Malone made the motion to take Assembly districts 17, 20 and 14 and include them with the balance of the state, seconded by Mr. Prengaman.

Mr. Sader commented that he felt that the area where the MX is to be located as well as the area impacted the most, Las Vegas, should be represented by the same Federal representative.

Mr. Malone felt that the state has been represented by one Congressman who considered the concerns of the state as a whole and that two Congressmen would each do the same.

Mr. Hickey said that the issue is one common area and he did not feel that these three districts were that.

When Mr. Prengaman asked if this problem was discussed in the Clark County delegation, Mr. Hickey said no.

Mr. Malone stated that if the MX does come to Nevada, there will be five satellite bases north of Clark County.

Mr. Beyer said he was impressed with how all legislators work together with the common interest of what is best for the state, and that he felt that the two elected Congressmen would do the same.

Mr. Prengaman said he thought the Clark County delegation should be polled for their opinion on which Assembly districts should be included with the balance of the state.

When the motion was brought to a vote, the motion died for lack of a majority with Mr. Chaney, Mr. Glover, Mr. Hickey, Mrs. Hayes and Mr. Sader voting no and with Mr. Robinson absent.

Since there was no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Patricia Hatch*

Patricia Hatch  
Secretary

ASSEMBLY

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

Date TUESDAY, APRIL 28 Time 3:00 P.M. Room 200.....

Bills or Resolutions  
to be considered

Subject

Counsel  
requested\*

WORK SESSION

\*Please do not ask for counsel unless necessary.