

MINUTES OF THE
MEETING OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE
ON GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS

SIXTY-FIRST SESSION
NEVADA STATE LEGISLATURE
January 21, 1981

The Senate Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chairman James I. Gibson, at 2:04 p.m., Wednesday, January 21, 1981, in Room 243 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada, Exhibit A is the Meeting Agenda. Exhibit B is the Attendance Roster.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator James I. Gibson, Chairman
Senator Jean Ford, Vice Chairman
Senator James N. Kosinski
Senator Gene Echols
Senator Virgil Getto
Senator Sue Wagner

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Senator Keith Ashworth (Excused)

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Andrew P. Grose, Research Director
Arthur J. Palmer, Administrative Director
Anne L. Lage, Committee Secretary

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 1

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

Chairman Gibson asked Mr. Andrew P. Grose, Research Director of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, to present his information to the committee in regard to the above mentioned resolution.

Mr. Grose stated that action taken by the 1979 Legislature increased the size of his division. One of the reasons this expansion was approved was to try to get a little

SENATE COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS
January 21, 1981

more direct support to committees. Mr. Grose emphasized that he was available to help committee members with any Government Affairs research they might need during this session.

In Reference to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 1, Mr. Grose explained that this bill came about as a result of a Legislative Counsel Bureau staff study which was made on all factors affecting this year's reapportionment. The Research Division realized that they needed some guidelines to establish a priority system to handle all the requests which they will receive in regard to the reapportionment issue. Mr. Grose referred the committee members to his memorandum which had two alternative recommendations. See Exhibit C.

Senator Kosinski inquired if the second option on Mr. Grose's memorandum was implemented, how might it be handled on a committee level.

Chairman Gibson responded that in no way should any legislator be restricted on introducing any bill. However, priorities could be set for the research which was to be done. After looking at Mr. Grose's options, Chairman Gibson suggested that the committee use the second option.

Mr. Arthur J. Palmer, Administrative Director, was called upon to address the committee regarding his experiences during the 1966 special session and the 1961 session on reapportionment. Based on these past experiences, Mr. Palmer concurred with Chairman Gibson's suggested use of the second option.

Chairman Gibson stated that the committee's function would be to set out the initial criteria of any plans which might be submitted to the committee.

Senator Ford wanted to know if once initial criteria was established, would it be available to everyone. Chairman Gibson was affirmative stating there would be displays available to everyone, the only difference would be that individuals would not have access to the computer.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS
January 21, 1981

There being no further discussion, the following motion was made:

Senator Echols moved that Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 1 be amended to drop the restriction on bill introduction, but retain the control and priority over the research work.

Senator Ford seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Gibson assigned Senator Ford to work with Mr. Grose regarding the language of the amended bill.

As a result of the discussions on the Senate floor that morning, and afterwards, it was brought to Chairman Gibson's attention that there were some flaws in the election laws, as the challenge to Senator Hernstadt pointed out. Chairman Gibson appointed a subcommittee to look into the problems encountered during the last election and perhaps initiate legislation to try to eliminate these problems from reoccurring. Those appointed to the committee were Senators Ford, Kosinski and Getto. Senator Ford was assigned chairman of the committee. Chairman Gibson stated that he would prepare a letter for Mr. William D. Swackhamer, Secretary of State, and also all county election offices to notify them of the committee's interest and inform them of the aforementioned appointments so they will understand this to be an official effort.

With no further business, Chairman Gibson adjourned the meeting at 2:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

Anne L. Lage
Anne L. Lage, Secretary

APPROVED BY:

James I. Gibson
Senator James I. Gibson, Chairman

DATE: 1/24/81

SENATE AGENDA

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Committee on Government Affairs, Room 243.

Day Wednesday, Date January 21, Time 2:00 p.m.

S. C. R. No. 1--Adds joint rule limiting research, bill drafting and introduction of bills on reapportionment to certain committees.

Andrew Grose, Research Director
Frank Daykin, Legislative Counsel
Senator Keith Ashworth, Chairman Legislative Commission

Committee discussion of session issues.

STATE OF NEVADA
LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU

LEGISLATIVE BUILDING
CAPITOL COMPLEX
CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89710



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

January 21, 1981

EXHIBIT C

MEMORANDUM

TO: Senate Government Affairs Committee
FROM: Andrew P. Grose, *Research Director*
SUBJECT: S.C.R. 1

S.C.R. 1 is actually the single recommendation from Bulletin No. 81-27, the Reapportionment study. It represents perhaps the most restrictive approach to the problem identified.

The problem is that staff time and computer access for reapportionment work are finite while possible demands for such time and access is theoretically infinite. In fact, the demands are not likely to be more than can be handled if there is some predictable flow of the requests for computer work and staff assistance on reapportionment. In other words, with a minimum of structure, the process should be able to handle all requests from all legislators.

In the absence of any action on this subject, the research division is left in the uncomfortable and perhaps impossible position of setting priorities among committees and individual legislators. Our normal policy on all requests is to do work as it comes to us. We do respond to identified short deadlines whenever possible.

May we suggest that the possibilities for a joint rule can be seen as a continuum of restrictiveness as follows:

1. S.C.R. 1 as drafted. Most restrictive, possibly raises fears about concentration of power in two committees.
2. Amend S.C.R. 1 to drop the restriction on bill introductions on reapportionment but retain it for any research work. As a practical matter, this would probably work as well as number 1 since there would be no data available to an individual legislator for a complete reapportionment plan.

EXHIBIT C

3. Simply state in the rule that priority on all reapportionment work by the research division be to the two committees. This is a bit harder to work with since it calls for the exercise of a lot more discretion by staff. Also, reapportionment will not be the only thing staff will be working on.

Any of these three approaches will be of assistance in doing the most efficient work we can on reapportionment and giving the staff some protection. Either of the first two do this considerably better than the third one.

APG:jlc