

**MINUTES OF THE JOINT MEETING OF THE  
SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON REDISTRICTING AND ELECTIONS  
AND THE  
ASSEMBLY SELECT COMMITTEE ON REDISTRICTING AND ELECTIONS**

**Thirty-third Special Session  
November 13, 2021**

The joint meeting of the Senate Select Committee on Redistricting and Elections and the Assembly Select Committee on Redistricting and Elections was called to order by Chair James Ohrenschall at 11:30 a.m. on Saturday, November 13, 2021, in Room 4100 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada and Online. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

**SENATE COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Senator James Ohrenschall, Chair  
Senator Roberta Lange, Vice Chair  
Senator Nicole J. Cannizzaro  
Senator Fabian Donate  
Senator Pete Goicoechea  
Senator Heidi Seevers Gansert  
Senator Carrie A. Buck

**ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblywoman Brittney Miller, Chair  
Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Vice Chair  
Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson  
Assemblyman Jason Frierson  
Assemblywoman Alexis Hansen  
Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui  
Assemblyman Glen Leavitt  
Assemblyman Andy Matthews  
Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno  
Assemblywoman Rochelle T. Nguyen  
Assemblywoman Jill Tolles

Senate Select Committee on Redistricting and Elections  
Assembly Committee on Select Committee on Redistricting and Elections  
November 13, 2021  
Page 2

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Assemblywoman Jill Dickman, Assembly District No. 31  
Assemblyman John C. Ellison, Assembly District No. 33  
Assemblyman Phillip P.K. O'Neill, Assembly District No. 40  
Assemblywoman Robin L. Titus, Assembly District No. 38

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Michael Stewart, Policy Analyst  
Asher Killian, Counsel  
Suzanne Efford, Committee Secretary

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Haley Proehl, Senior Policy Analyst, Geographic Information System Specialist,  
Information Technology Services, Legislative Counsel Bureau  
Kathy Steinle, Redistricting Specialist, Information Technology Services,  
Legislative Counsel Bureau  
Michael Kelly  
Anna Villatoro, Children's Advocacy Alliance  
Andre Wade, State Director, Silver State Equality  
Quentin Savvoir, Deputy Director, Make It Work Nevada  
Emily Persaud-Zamora, Silver State Voices  
Paula Luna  
Vinson Guthreau, Executive Director, Nevada Association of Counties  
Taylor Patterson, Executive Director, Native Voters Alliance Nevada  
Christine Saunders, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada  
Benjamin Challinor, Faith in Action Nevada  
Annette Magnus, Executive Director, Battle Born Progress  
Eli Trimble  
Alondra Flores  
Eduardo Alvarez  
Yvette Williams  
Claudia Morales  
Guillermo Barahona, Civic Engagement Director, Chispa Nevada  
Doug Busselman  
Luce

Senate Select Committee on Redistricting and Elections  
Assembly Committee on Select Committee on Redistricting and Elections  
November 13, 2021  
Page 3

Carlos Reese  
Reina Reese  
Isabelle  
Tammi Tiger, Las Vegas Indian Center  
Darielys Rodriguez  
Imer Cesbedes  
Charisse Gress  
Sylvia Lazos  
Issis Juliao  
Jon Karr, Chair, Elko County Commission  
Bev Stenehjem  
Amy Koo, Asian Community Development Council  
Chris Roman  
Carol Fineberg  
Randy Case  
Keith Metcalfe

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

We will open the hearing on Senate Bill (S.B.) No. 1. Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) staff has been asked to present only the factual highlights of S.B. 1 and describe the geographic, population and demographic features of the redistricting plans set forth in S.B. 1. The LCB staff will not be able to explain or answer questions relating to the rationale or reasons for a particular mapping choice. Instead, the LCB staff will only cover the informational aspects of the measure.

**SENATE BILL 1**: Revises the election districts for members of the Legislature, members of the State Board of Education and Representatives in Congress and the petition districts for certain statewide initiatives or referendums. (BDR 17-9)

MICHAEL STEWART (Research Director, Legislative Counsel Bureau, Research Division):

We have been asked to provide factual information regarding the reapportionment and redistricting plan set forth in S.B. 1 of the Thirty-third Special Session. We will present only basic factual information about the redistricting proposal in S.B. 1 impacting the U.S. House of Representatives, the Nevada State Senate and the Nevada State Assembly.

We will not be able to answer questions relating to the rationale as to why a district boundary may have been drawn one way and not another because these were decisions made by the authors of the bill.

With each plan, Haley Proehl, Senior Policy Analyst and Geographic Information System (GIS) Specialist with the LCB Research Division, will start with an explanation of the key geographic components and features of the overall plan and some district-specific information.

Kathy Steinle, Redistricting Specialist with the LCB Information Technology Services (ITS), will follow with an overview of district population and relevant deviation information from ideal population as well as other related statistics.

I will highlight certain information regarding race and ethnic minority concentrations and related features in select legislative districts. I have submitted copies of the associated maps and tables, ([Exhibit B](#), [Exhibit C](#), [Exhibit D](#), [Exhibit E](#), [Exhibit F](#) and [Exhibit G](#)).

HALEY PROEHL (Senior Policy Analyst, Geographic Information System Specialist, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau):

In the congressional plan map, [Exhibit B](#), pages 1 and 2, Nevada has four congressional seats as determined by the 2020 U.S. Census results. This is the same number of seats Nevada currently has. Nevada neither gained nor lost a seat as a result of the Census.

The congressional plan in S.B. 1 establishes four distinct geographical districts: Congressional District 2 is in northern Nevada; Congressional District 4 comprises central Nevada and northern Clark County; and Congressional Districts 1 and 3 are wholly contained within Clark County, [Exhibit B](#), page 1. Congressional District 3 contains western parts of the Las Vegas core and extends down to the southern tip of the State, and Congressional District 1 contains eastern parts of the Las Vegas core as well as Henderson and Boulder City. The North Las Vegas area is within Congressional District 4, [Exhibit B](#), pages 1 and 2.

Except for Clark County, Lyon County is the only county divided between Congressional Districts 2 and 4 in the congressional plan.

KATHY STEINLE (Redistricting Specialist, Information Technology Services, Legislative Counsel Bureau):

The congressional districts have a nearly even population. There are 776,154 people in Congressional Districts 1 and 3, and there are 776,153 in Congressional Districts 2 and 4, [Exhibit C](#), page 1. Please note that the ideal population is calculated by dividing the number of districts into the total State population. Thus, 3,104,614 divided by 4 equals 776,153.5. Therefore, due to rounding, the deviation numbers are actually 0.50 for Congressional Districts 1 and 3 and -0.50 for Congressional Districts 2 and 4, [Exhibit C](#), page 1. By adding the largest positive deviation to the largest negative deviation, the result is an overall range of deviation of 1 which is 0.00 percent.

MR. STEWART:

On the Racial Data Report, [Exhibit C](#), page 2, in the White alone category, the highest percentage is in Congressional District 2 with 67.65 percent.

In the Black or African American category, which includes Black or African American with another race or races, the high number is 19.39 percent in Congressional District 4.

In the American Indian and Alaskan Native category, including American Indian and Alaskan Native with any other race or races, the high percentage is in Congressional District 2 with 4.90 percent.

In the Asian category, including Asian with any other race or races, the high percentage is in Congressional District 3 with 21.12 percent.

The Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander category, including Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander with any other race or races, is evenly disbursed, but Congressional District 3 has the highest percentage at 2.35 percent.

In the Some Other Race Alone category, Congressional District 1 and Congressional District 4 are close in percentages with 17.97 percent and 18.29 percent respectively.

In the Two or More Races category, there is similar distribution of this category across all the plans and is consistent in every table.

In the Hispanic or Latino of any race category, the numbers for Congressional District 1 and Congressional District 4 are 35.45 percent and 34.88 percent respectively.

MS. PROEHL:

The Senate plan in [S.B. 1](#) establishes 21 Senate Districts with 15 Senate Districts wholly within Clark County, 5 Senate Districts in western Nevada, including 2 Senate Districts wholly within Washoe County and 1 Senate District which includes the eastern part of the State and parts of Clark County, [Exhibit D](#), pages 1, 2 and 3.

In addition to Clark County and Washoe County, four counties are divided among Senate districts in the plan. Those four counties are Elko County, Eureka County, Lander County and Nye County.

All Assembly districts are nested within the Senate districts which means that each Senate district wholly contains two Assembly districts. The Population Report in the Senate plan, [Exhibit E](#), page 1, contains the pairings of the Assembly districts for each Senate district.

MS. STEINLE:

The ideal population for a 21 District Senate plan is 147,839, [Exhibit E](#), page 1. In this plan, the largest positive deviation is in Senate District 5 at 1,400 which is 0.95 percent. The largest negative deviation is in Senate District 17 at negative -3,453 which is negative -2.34 percent. Therefore, the overall range of deviation is 4,853 which is 3.28 percent.

MR. STEWART:

In the Senate Racial Data Report, [Exhibit E](#), page 2, I will only highlight the high percentages. In the White Alone category, the high percentages are in proposed Senate District 16 at 73.4 percent, Senate District 17 at 77.12 percent, Senate District 19 at 71.61 percent and Senate District 20 at 73.1 percent.

In the Black or African American category the high percentages are in Senate District 1 at 26.77 percent, Senate District 3 at 17.32 percent, Senate District 4 at 28.94 percent and Senate District 10 at 19.65 percent.

In the American Indian and Alaskan Native category, the high percentages are in Senate District 13 at 4.44 percent, Senate District 14 at 6.31 percent, Senate District 17 at 6.38 percent and Senate District 19 at 4.64 percent.

In the Asian, including Asian with another race or races category, the high percentages are in Senate District 8 at 18.87 percent, Senate District 9 at 26.13 percent, Senate District 11 at 30.46 percent and Senate District 12 at 18.45 percent.

In the Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander category, the high percentage districts are Senate District 11 at 3 percent and Senate District 12 at 3.34 percent.

In the Some Other Race Alone category, the high percentage districts are Senate District 2 at 39.48 percent, Senate District 4 at 28.75 percent, Senate District 13 at 19.22 percent and Senate District 21 at 29.13 percent.

In the Two or More Races category, the percentages are evenly disbursed from a low of 10.71 percent in Senate District 17 to highs of 17.48 percent in Senate Districts 2 and 20.

In the Hispanic or Latino category, the high percentage districts are Senate District 2 with 64.72 percent, Senate District 4 at 48.51 percent, Senate District 7 at 38.38 percent, Senate District 10 at 33.62 percent, Senate District 13 at 36.07 percent and Senate District 21 at 52.31 percent.

MS. PROEHL:

The Assembly plan in S.B. 1 establishes 42 Assembly Districts, [Exhibit F](#), page 1. Thirty of those districts are wholly within Clark County. One additional Assembly district in southern Nevada contains parts of Clark County, Nye County and Lincoln County, [Exhibit F](#), page 2.

There are 10 Assembly districts in western Nevada. Six Assembly districts are wholly within Washoe County. One Assembly district contains parts of Washoe County, Elko County, Eureka County, Lander County, Humboldt County and Pershing County. One Assembly district contains parts of Washoe County and all of Carson City and Storey County. One Assembly district includes all of Churchill County, Esmeralda County, Mineral County, Lyon County, Nye County

and parts of Lander County. One additional Assembly district in western Nevada contains all of Douglas County and part of Lyon County, [Exhibit F](#), page 3.

Proposed Assembly District 33 contains the eastern part of the State which extends from Elko County to Lincoln County and Nye County, [Exhibit F](#), page 1.

In addition to Clark County and Washoe County, the counties divided among Assembly districts in S.B. 1 are Elko County, Eureka County, Lander County, Lincoln County, Lyon County and Nye County.

All Assembly districts are nested within Senate districts. Two Assembly districts will be within one Senate district.

MS. STEINLE:

The ideal population for a 42 district Assembly plan is 73,919, [Exhibit G](#), page 1. In this plan, the largest positive deviation is in Assembly District 22 at 876 which is 1.18 percent. The largest negative deviation is in Assembly District 38 at -1,736 which is -2.35 percent. Therefore, the overall range of deviation is 2,612 which is 3.53 percent.

MR. STEWART:

In the Assembly Racial Data Report, [Exhibit G](#), page 2, I will, again, highlight only the high percentages.

In the White Alone category, the high percentages are in Assembly District 19 at 73.72 percent, Assembly District 23 at 72.47 percent, Assembly District 31 at 70.83 percent, Assembly District 33 at 73.07 percent, Assembly District 36 at 70.14 percent, Assembly District 38 at 73.96 percent, Assembly District 39 at 80.28 percent and Assembly District 40 at 71.71 percent.

In the Black or African American category, the high percentages are in Assembly District 1 at 21.30 percent, Assembly District 6 at 31.72 percent, Assembly District 7 at 26.14 percent, Assembly District 15 at 20.99 percent and Assembly District 17 at 32.24 percent.

In the American Indian and Alaskan Native category, the high percentages are in Assembly District 24 at 4.42 percent, Assembly District 27 at 4.22 percent, Assembly District 30 at 4.46 percent, Assembly District 32 at 9.03 percent,



Assembly District 38 at 8.05 percent, Assembly District 39 at 4.70 percent and Assembly District 40 at 4.93 percent.

In the Asian, including Asian with other races, the high percentages are in Assembly District 8 at 34.27 percent, Assembly District 35 at 26.65 percent, Assembly District 41 at 21.57 percent and Assembly District 42 at 23.55 percent.

In the Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander category, the high percentages are in Assembly District 9 at 2.61 percent, Assembly District 17 at 2.35 percent, Assembly District 21 at 2.60 percent, Assembly District 35 at 2.81 percent and Assembly District 41 at 4.09 percent.

In the Some Other Race Alone category, the high percentages are in Assembly District 6 at 33.64 percent, Assembly District 11 at 39.57 percent, Assembly District 14 at 33.28 percent and Assembly District 28 at 39.39 percent.

In the Two or More Races category, the disbursement is pretty equal with a low of 10.04 percent in Assembly District 38 and a high of 17.79 percent in Assembly District 14.

In the Hispanic or Latino category, the high percentage districts are Assembly District 6 with 54.04 percent, Assembly District 7 at 42.94 percent, Assembly District 10 at 41.70 percent, Assembly District 12 at 46.79 percent, Assembly District 14 at 57.83 percent and Assembly District 28 at 64.38 percent.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NGUYEN:

Would you review the Asian, Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander numbers in the Congressional, Senate and Assembly races? Can you compare that to the 2011 maps?

MR. STEWART:

In 2011, for the Asian and Asian with other races category, in Congressional District 1, it was 9.30 percent, and you can see that comparison now with 10.38 percent in S.B. 1. For Congressional District 2, it was 5 percent, and now it is 6.23 percent. Congressional District 3 was 14.85 percent in 2011 versus 21.12 percent in S.B. 1, and 6.82 percent in Congressional District 4 in 2011 and 7.83 percent in S.B. 1.

Senate Select Committee on Redistricting and Elections  
Assembly Committee on Select Committee on Redistricting and Elections  
November 13, 2021  
Page 10

ASSEMBLYMAN LEAVITT:

I appreciate the factual information. I probably have many questions that you cannot answer. However, do we know who created these maps? I am assuming it was not you. You gave a factual presentation on the maps that were given to you and on the numbers you calculated in accordance with these maps.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

Each caucus in each House worked with the GIS specialist at LCB to make the recommendations. This bill comes out of that work. Does that answer your question?

ASSEMBLYMAN LEAVITT:

It does answer my question. I was wondering if we were going to have the opportunity to dig deeper into that portion of it.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

If you need more information, perhaps it could be submitted after the hearing.

SENATOR BUCK:

How did you minimize the deviation within the maps?

MR. STEWART:

I am not sure we can comment about how those decisions were made regarding the overall deviations both high and low. That was done by the authors of the bill.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MONROE-MORENO:

How was the deviation determined? What is the acceptable deviation between the congressional districts?

MS. STEINLE:

The ideal population was determined by dividing the State total population of 3,104,614 by the 4 congressional districts which resulted in 776,153.5. Because there cannot be half a person, this is how the deviations of positive 0.50 and negative -0.50 were determined in Congressional Districts 1 and 3 and Congressional Districts 2 and 4 respectively.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MONROE-MORENO:

What is the acceptable amount of deviation between congressional districts?  
Can it be a large deviation or a small deviation?

ASHER KILLIAN (Senior Principal Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division,  
Legislative Counsel Bureau):

Two different standards apply depending on whether the electoral districts in question are legislative districts or congressional districts. The Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment to the *U.S. Constitution* applies to both. That clause requires relatively equal sizes for congressional districts. However, Article 1, Section 2 of the *U.S. Constitution* also applies, which imposes a requirement that congressional districts be as nearly equal as is practicable which is generally interpreted to be as close to exact mathematical equality as possible. Therefore, in the case of Nevada where the ideal population involves half-of-a-person, congressional districts could not be exactly mathematically equal because half-of-a-person does not exist. In that situation, an overall range of one person is within the safe harbor established by the U.S. Supreme Court.

A deviation of more than one person is possible if there are other factors that are necessary for the deviation to be greater than one person. However, U. S. Supreme Court precedent holds that, in that case, if deviation is greater than one person, and any alternative map could be presented that satisfies the same objectives with a smaller deviation, the map with a larger deviation will be struck down. Effectively, a deviation of one person is the known safe harbor. The congressional district map, as presented, is within that known safe harbor deviation.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

How do the high and low deviations in certain State legislative districts proposed in S.B. 1 compare with districts that were drawn in 2011 in terms of highs and lows?

MS. STEINLE:

In 2011, the largest positive deviation was 0.23 percent and the largest negative deviation -0.57 percent. That is an overall deviation of 0.80 percent for the 2011 Senate districts.

Senate Select Committee on Redistricting and Elections  
Assembly Committee on Select Committee on Redistricting and Elections  
November 13, 2021  
Page 12

For the 2011 Assembly districts, the largest positive deviation was 0.52 percent. The largest negative deviation was -0.82 percent which is an overall deviation of 1.33 percent.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN HANSEN:

Who is going to answer questions regarding the intent behind some of the processes of redistricting, the splitting of certain counties and the splitting of communities of interest?

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

As I mentioned earlier, each caucus in each House worked with the GIS Specialists of the LCB. Senate Bill 1 is the product of that work.

During the hearing today, we are going to hear proposed amendments. Proposed alternative maps have been submitted and are online. There is going to be quite a discussion about alternatives, but S.B. 1 is what we are working with right now.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN HANSEN:

I will just ask my questions in a rhetorical manner, put them on the record and hope to get some sort of answers or clarifications. I understand the authors of these maps would be the Majority Party. I was hoping that leadership would be able to answer our questions.

I am feeling at a loss at being unable to ask the questions my constituents are asking me. I am hoping I can get some answers from the authors of the Majority Party maps.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

I appreciate your comments, Assemblywoman Hansen. Senate Bill 1 is a proposal. It is not a law yet. We are going to have a robust discussion about it into the late hours today.

SENATOR SEEVERS GANSERT:

Washoe County voter registrations are one-third Republican, one-third Democrat, one-third nonpartisan and other. However, proposed Senate Districts 13 and 15 are wholly within Washoe County and are both 6.7 percent, or more, favoring Democrats. Even though registration is almost exactly equal at

32.7 percent Democrat, 32.7 percent Republican, 34.7 percent nonpartisan and other.

Both of the Senate districts wholly in Washoe County are supermajority Democrats. How did that happen? Was there a substantial shift in Senate District 15? It looks like the boundaries were moved, and I want to have a better understanding. When I look at proposed District 14, I see three significant communities of interest: Somersett, a planned unit community which is part of the City of Reno; Verdi, of which a large portion is part of the City of Reno and Cold Springs, which has been partially annexed to the City of Reno. It appears that they have been severed and moved to proposed District 14. Proposed Senate District 14 stretches all the way to Elko.

Communities of interest, also in the political subdivision of the City of Reno, have been moved to proposed Senate District 14 instead of proposed Senate District 15. Senate District 15 wholly contains Washoe County. How does that work?

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

I am not sure if the LCB presenters can answer that question. They are here to answer technical questions about the demographics in each proposed district. I appreciate you bringing your concerns about whether a community of interest may have been split up to the Committee. However, that is not a question LCB can answer.

SENATOR SEEVERS GANSERT:

I submitted two exhibits, one was the redistricting case in the First Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada from 2011 ([Exhibit H](#)) and the other was the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) Redistricting Criteria ([Exhibit I](#)).

Are the principles introduced by the NCSL common principles? Those principles are compactness, contiguity, preservation of counties and other political subdivisions, preservation of communities of interest, preservation of cores of prior districts and avoiding pairing incumbents. Looking at NCSL's list and the Court case from 2011, the items that were to be used by the special masters were contiguous districts, political subdivisions, communities of interest, general appearance, which should be rectangular or circular, and incumbents. When

I look at the way Senate District 14 was redrawn instead of Senate District 15, and I see this arc; an irregularity. I see a severing of communities of interest and political subdivisions. I want to know if the considerations of NCSL and the Court-appointed special master in 2011 are valid principles for redistricting.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

That is another question the presenters cannot answer. The NCSL Redistricting Criteria and the ten-year-old legal decision out of the First Judicial District Court has been posted. It appears that the Interim Committee to Conduct an Investigation into Matters Relating to Reapportionment and Redistricting in Nevada took those principles into account. If any member of this Committee or the public has concerns, I can bring those up.

SENATOR SEEVERS GANSERT:

We need to know that those principles are a reasonable basis for redistricting.

MR. KILLIAN:

The *Constitution of the State of Nevada* requires that redistricting done by the Legislature be based on census population. Outside of that requirement, the *Constitution of the State of Nevada* imposes no other restrictions or principles on the process. It leaves that to the discretion of the Nevada Legislature. That said, there are two elements of federal law that impose requirements on the process, specifically, the Equal Protection Clause of the *U.S. Constitution*, 14th Amendment, Section 1, which requires districts to be of relatively equal population. That is the one person, one vote concept. Then the 14th and 15th Amendments to the *U.S. Constitution* and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 require an equitable treatment of racial and language minorities.

Outside of those three requirements imposed by federal law and the *Constitution of the State of Nevada*, the remainder of the principles that guide the redistricting process are up to the Legislature itself.

In Joint Standing Rule 13.1 adopted by the Legislature for the Thirty-third Special Session, the concept of equality of representation is acknowledged as one of the guiding principles for the Legislature. The concept of compliance with the Voting Rights Act of 1965 is acknowledged by the Legislature as a guiding principle in Joint Standing Rule 13.5.

Outside of that, all other matters would be up to Legislative discretion. The traditional districting principles acknowledged by NCSL are certainly principles the Legislature and this Committee could take into account when drawing districts; however, they are not binding on the Legislature in any way, unless the Legislature chooses to bind itself with those principles.

SENATOR SEEVERS GANSERT:

In 2011, when redistricting went to District Court, the special master had a list of principles that should be applied, [Exhibit H](#). Does that hold true now, or is that another one where there is discretion? We do not necessarily have to follow what the Court said in 2011.

MR. KILLIAN:

Generally, when the courts become involved in the redistricting process, they adhere much more closely to those traditional districting principles. Because in 2011, after the Legislature passed maps and they were vetoed by then Governor Brian Sandoval and the Legislature was not called back into special session, the courts were required to draw the maps. The Court chose to adhere closely to those traditional districting principles. However, that is not binding on the Legislature itself since the *U.S. Constitution* gives the Legislature rather wide discretion in choosing its own principles. As long as the Legislature retains control of the redistricting process, it can choose whether it wants to follow those principles.

SENATOR SEEVERS GANSERT:

Going back to the *U.S. Constitution* guaranteeing equal participation and rights for all voters, my understanding is that citizens have the right to participate equally in the political process, to join with others to advance political briefs and to choose their political representatives. My concern is ensuring the maps support and follow that guarantee.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Will we be able to separate the congressional districts maps and the Legislative District maps and vote on them separately in the interest of bipartisanship?

Senate Select Committee on Redistricting and Elections  
Assembly Committee on Select Committee on Redistricting and Elections  
November 13, 2021  
Page 16

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

Senate Bill 1, as introduced, encompasses all of the proposed changes to both the Legislative and Congressional Districts. It will be a vote on everything as presented in the bill.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

If we are here to represent our constituents, I am concerned that not enough consultation was done early on, especially as we look at some of the rural areas. Call them whatever you want, a county or a city, they are a community of interest. They elect their school boards and vote on their school bonds. I do not understand how we can separate them.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON:

We had public meetings and some of us were on the Committee that participated in those public hearings to seek input from communities. Mr. Stewart, could you provide information on some of that work about the process and the portal process for the public submission of maps?

MR. STEWART:

Recently, the Legislature embarked on four public hearings for the reapportionment and redistricting process. They occurred on October 7, October 23, October 27 and October 28. One virtually, one in Carson City, one in Las Vegas and one in Fallon. The public was given the opportunity to participate. What the Committee heard in presentations was a truncated version of what the interim study in the 2019 Interim heard as well, which was information about the U.S. Census data.

We heard about the history of reapportionment and redistricting and how the Legislature looked over time. We also heard some detailed legal presentations from the LCB Legal Division and some presentations from the State Demographer. In the previous interim, we heard from the Nevada Census 2020 Complete Count Committee about the census operations in Nevada. And, as you mentioned, we had considerable discussion about how the public could participate through the MyDistricting application on the Legislature's website. The MyDistricting application is new, and the public can submit plans that way. The October schedule was robust. We also held meetings before the 2021 Legislative Session.



Senate Select Committee on Redistricting and Elections  
Assembly Committee on Select Committee on Redistricting and Elections  
November 13, 2021  
Page 17

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

How many proposed maps have been submitted on the MyDistricting application?

MS. STEINLE:

Thirty-three plans were submitted for the congressional plan, five plans were submitted for the Senate plan, four plans were submitted for the Assembly plan and one plan for border regions.

ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER:

As Senator Seevers Gansert had referenced in the NCSL handout, [Exhibit I](#), one of the principles the Legislature could choose to follow would be compactness. Compactness is defined as "having the minimum distance between all parts of a constituency; a circle, square or a hexagon being the most compact district."

As Mr. Killian noted, the Legislature is not obligated to abide by that principle. However, in 2011, the District Court did abide by that principle in drawing the maps. Can you speak to compactness in the maps presented in [S.B. 1](#) for the Assembly and the Senate as compared to the compactness of the maps drawn by the District Court in 2011?

MR. STEWART:

We would have to take some time to do a geographic compactness analysis or some sort of overlay since the maps contain the same number of districts. We could attempt to do that, if you like, so you can do that comparison and see how those districts match up. There are definitely different boundaries.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

Is that something you want?

ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER:

I am not trying to have anyone do more work. However, if that is something you are able to opine on through a statistical analysis or comparison of maps, I would appreciate it.

Senate Select Committee on Redistricting and Elections  
Assembly Committee on Select Committee on Redistricting and Elections  
November 13, 2021  
Page 18

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TOLLES:

Mr. Killian, you spoke about the Interim Committee to Conduct an Investigation into Matters Relating to Reapportionment and Redistricting in Nevada. Could you share the recommendations of the Committee?

MR. KILLIAN:

I do not have the recommendations in front of me. I know they made recommendations about provisions to be included in the joint pools regarding staff to be hired, equipment to be purchased for the Legislature's use during the redistricting process and a few other related matters.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TOLLES:

A few of those principles or priorities have been mentioned such as compactness. When I look at the proposed map, [Exhibit F](#), page 1, Assembly District 33 would be, as I understand it, the largest Assembly district in the United States. I wonder about the future representative for that district and his or her ability to meaningfully connect with all of the constituents over so many square miles.

MR. STEWART:

Assembly District 33 is a large district. We have not done an analysis of how it compares to other districts nationwide. I cannot comment about how a representative would be able to capture all of those communities. Some members of this Committee have very large districts so they might be better able to comment on how they accommodate those large geographies.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TOLLES:

What are the number of districts that would meet the recommendation of not splitting communities of interest?

MR. STEWART:

The Committee requested one Bill Draft Request to increase the maximum number of active voters permitted in an election district from 3,000 to 5,000. The Legislature approved that bill in the 2021 Legislative Session.

Other recommendations involved the purchasing of redistricting software licenses and the required parallel hardware to assist the Legislature's reapportionment and redistricting exercises through its GIS. They approved the

hiring of four, session-only employees: GIS technicians, one assigned to each caucus in order to assist with GIS support and provide related services during the 2021 Legislative Session, but the data was delayed. The Committee voted to select, for use during the redistricting exercise, an elections database that includes comprehensive election information from several competitive elections. Those competitive elections are set forth in the tables on pages 3, 4 and 5 in each plan, [Exhibit C](#), [Exhibit E](#) and [Exhibit G](#).

In addition to selecting that election information, the Committee made some suggestions for the adoption of the Joint Standing Rules for the Senate and the Assembly. Most of the proposals were to mirror the rules from the 2011 process. One of the new rules was the nesting of Assembly and Senate districts. That was suggested because that seems to be a popular aspect of your current redistricting plans.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TOLLES:

Based on the proposed plan in [S.B. 1](#), how many counties would be split into various representation by districts?

Ms. PROEHL:

In the Senate plan, six counties are split: Clark County, Elko County, Eureka County, Lander County, Nye County and Washoe County.

In the Assembly plan, eight counties are split: Clark County, Elko County, Eureka County, Lincoln County, Lander County, Lyon County, Nye County and Washoe County.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TOLLES:

How many towns are being split in the proposed Senate and Assembly plans?

Ms. PROEHL:

We have not yet done that analysis. However, we could take a look at that.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TOLLES:

There has been much interest in the tribal communities. Assembly Districts 31 and 32 on the proposed maps appear to be split through a tribal reservation. Is there any data on these plans and how certain tribal communities might be split?

Ms. PROEHL:

We have not yet done a close analysis of that. That is also something we could do. The U.S. Census Bureau does provide boundaries for American Indian reservation and colony areas.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TOLLES:

That information is important to constituents and to communities.

I have concerns about Homeowner Associations (HOA) and planned communities that share the same Boards. That will probably be the same answer because that is quite broad. In fact, some of the examples I see are Somersett in Washoe County split into Sun Valley, split into three.

Going back to the areas of Washoe Valley, Pleasant Valley, Hidden Valley and even a split in Desert Willow Golf Course, is there any way we could take a look at how we are splitting up HOAs and communities of interest? We all love to hear from our HOA constituents. They are actively involved, and I am sure they would like to hear how these plans will impact their representation.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

Can information on towns, HOAs and Native American tribes be readily obtained?

Mr. STEWART:

That might be possible, but we might have challenges determining HOA boundaries in this time frame. The others we can probably come up with from a GIS perspective.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TOLLES:

How do we define competitiveness or what constitutes a swing district?

Ms. PROEHL:

The elections selected for use in the redistricting database were competitive elections. The basis for that was the smallest percent winning margin. The smaller the percent winning margin between the two candidates of the major parties. Those are more competitive on a relative scale.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TOLLES:

Would plus or minus 4 percent be considered competitive? Is that how we define small?

Ms. PROEHL:

The smallest percent difference was 0.47 percent for the 2018 Attorney General contest. The 2018 contest for Secretary of State was 0.66 percent. The percentage differences in the 2 presidential elections were 2.42 percent for 2016 and 2.39 percent for the 2020 election. All of those figures were below 3 percent.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TOLLES:

That is helpful data. I am wondering why an Assembly district has moved from a 6-percent-plus Republican advantage to a -3.6-percent Democrat advantage when it only had a -1.4 percent deviation in ideal population?

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

I am not sure that is a question that the LCB presenters can answer.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:

We talked about deviation in maps, and Mr. Killian talked specifically about the proposed congressional maps and trying to get close to one person and about the half-of-a-person. The maps currently submitted are within that allowable amount. For legislative maps, my understanding is that the deviation is different. It does not have to be down to one person. Is that accurate?

MR. KILLIAN:

That is correct. The much more precise requirement for Congressional Districts is because of Article 1, Section 2 of the *U.S. Constitution*. The U.S. Supreme Court has interpreted that to impose the requirement that they be as nearly as equal as practicable. The provision that applies to state legislative districts is just the Equal Protection clause which is still a significant requirement of substantial equality but not nearly as exacting. Case law on state legislative districts is that as long as the overall range of deviation is less than 10 percent—plus or minus 5 percent for the districts—that is a minimal range of deviation as long as there is some factor that justifies the deviation.

A deviation of an overall range of more than 10 percent is presumed to be too large unless some necessary factor requires that range of deviation. Both sets of maps contained in S.B. 1 are well under that range. They would be within the range of deviation that the U.S. Supreme Court has held is minimal and acceptable for state legislative districts.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:

The proposed maps in S.B. 1 are obviously less than 5 percent on either end so they fall within that 10-percent range. I wanted to make sure we were clear about the deviation because it is different between some of the maps.

In the 2020 pre-COVID-19 Committee to Conduct an Interim Study of the Requirements for Reapportionment and Redistricting in the State of Nevada meeting, we heard about the different software that was available and what the State might consider purchasing. One of the recommendations was the MyDistricting software we have been using. That software allows individuals to draw their own maps and submit a map for consideration. Is that correct?

Ms. PROEHL:

Yes, that is correct.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:

Those maps would be available for anyone to view online?

Ms. PROEHL:

Yes, that is correct.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:

If anyone is interested in seeing those maps that had been created using that software, they could go online and see what other people have drawn?

Ms. PROEHL:

Yes, that is correct.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:

When we were going through the pages, I noticed a page for communities of interest. Was that also something that was allowed to be submitted via the Legislative website in the MyDistricting software?

Ms. PROEHL:

Yes, that was an option for users.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:

I ask because I represent an area in which Sun City Summerlin is located. A couple of communities of interest, Sun City Summerlin and Inspirada, had submitted maps online.

Ms. PROEHL:

Yes, that is correct.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:

So, those are defined. Are these maps within a single Senate district? Is Sun City Summerlin in Senate District 6, and is Inspirada in Senate District 12 on these proposed maps?

Ms. PROEHL:

I cannot say for certain. I have not done that analysis yet, but that is something we could look at and determine by overlaying those communities of interest into these district maps.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:

I would like to get that answer from you. It appeared that they were when I reviewed the maps that were submitted by those communities of interest. That would have been available for any community of interest, whether an HOA or whatever falls within the definition of community of interest. They could have also submitted those on the Legislative website. Is that correct?

Ms. PROEHL:

Yes, that is correct.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:

We talked a little bit about compactness. I know you have not done a full compactness analysis of these maps. I understand there are different measures of compactness. One of those is the Polsby-Popper test that measures the compactness of districts. The closer to one they are; the more compact they are. The further away from one; the less compact they are. That would be

something that could be applied to our proposed maps as currently drawn or to any proposed maps.

I wanted to share that information. I know you are going to do some follow up on that. Hopefully, we can get some confirmation on the Polsby-Popper scores for the Assembly average districts which from the 2011 maps is 0.374 percent and from the 2021 proposed maps is 0.402 percent. So, that is closer to one indicating they are more compact.

In the Senate maps from 2011, I believe it is 0.37 percent, and on the 2021 proposed maps, it is 0.384 percent. Again, being closer to one indicating they are more compact.

I do not mean to be giving you extra work, but that was part of these maps. I would appreciate any follow-up confirmation on those.

ASSEMBLYMAN MATTHEWS:

I want to stay on the issue of deviation from the ideal and want to recap and make sure I have these right.

Under the plan put forward on the legislative maps in S.B. 1, I believe you said that the overall range in deviation for the Senate would be 3.28 percent, and for the Assembly, it would be 3.53 percent. Is that correct?

MS. STEINLE:

Yes, that is correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN MATTHEWS:

You also said that for the 2011 maps, the comparable number for the Senate was 0.80 percent and 1.33 percent for the Assembly. Is that correct?

MS. STEINLE:

Yes, it is.

ASSEMBLYMAN MATTHEWS:

Looking at this, it appears there is a significant increase in the overall deviation from 2011 to the 2021 proposed maps. It appears to be three-to-four times



greater. Why do the maps in the proposed plan have such a significant increase in deviation over the 2011 maps?

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

I am not sure if any of the presenters can speak to that.

ASSEMBLYMAN MATTHEWS:

We talked about the idea of splitting counties and towns. Senator Tolles asked if we knew how many towns were being split with these maps. In my looking at it, and I know we are trying to get the specific numbers, it appears that the congressional maps and the legislative maps would each split six towns a piece.

We know that in drawing these district lines, one of the things we tried to ensure was to minimize the different types of ballots our local election administrators would have to create. So, with an eye toward that, we should try to take into consideration some of the local government boundaries. Seeing the number of towns being split and trying to adhere to some of these principles, would you agree that the more we divert from that and the more towns that are split, the more we frustrate the attempt to achieve the goal of respecting local boundaries and minimizing that work for our local election officials?

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

I am not sure the presenters can answer that. We might have testimony from election officials who may be able to reply to your concerns.

MR. STEWART:

It is difficult for LCB staff to discuss the rationale about where splits went and where they did not go. We have heard from local election officials about their concerns. It is easier for them to preserve fewer ballot styles. They have commented on that before in public settings.

ASSEMBLYMAN MATTHEWS:

We heard some discussion about the community outreach meetings that were held around the State to seek public input into this process. Were any maps presented at any of these meetings?

MR. STEWART:

We had one person, Mr. Darby, who might have referenced a map that he submitted on the MyDistricting page. We can review that, but I think that is the only one we had.

ASSEMBLYMAN MATTHEWS:

Can someone speak to the decision to include a picture as a description of these districts as opposed to actual descriptions of streets or even coordinates? Can you speak to the reasoning for that and what the aims of taking that approach might have been?

MR. KILLIAN:

That is a departure with the bill drafts for this Thirty-third Special Session as compared to previous redistricting bills the Legislature has done. Previously, the bill would contain a list of census geographies for each district which is effectively just a recreation of the contents of a shapefile. The approach that the bills took this time was to adopt the shapefile itself directly.

It is adopting the best evidence of those contents rather than recreating those contents in text form in the bill. The images that are contained in the bill are just a descriptive representation of the contents of that shapefile. This time around, the Legislature is actually adopting the best possible evidence of those boundaries in a standard format that any sort of GIS or redistricting software could import, as opposed to a list of text that is only a representation of those boundaries. The maps are included in the bill, not as operative legal language but as a description of the contents of the shapefiles so you can verify the shapefile contains the maps you are expecting.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:

We were talking about deviations. My prior question was related to whether the deviation falls within that 5 percent on either end of the 10-percent range for legislative maps. The proposed maps in S.B. 1 do fall within that particular range.

You also mentioned that we would look at other factors to help illustrate why, or why not, there may be deviations that are different. That would be part of the analysis on a deviation. Would things like preserving rural representation in

rural seats, and not taking those away from rural areas, be something that could be considered with respect to deviations?

MR. KILLIAN:

That is generally correct. The equality of population within the districts is one of several factors the Legislature considers when drawing lines. All of the factors considered in redistricting, all of the traditional principles in addition to the mandatory principles, can come into conflict. The underlying political geography, city boundaries, county boundaries, state boundaries, can be irregularly shaped. In an attempt to maintain the integrity of that underlying political geography, districts may be less compact or may have less equal population as a result of preserving those underlying boundaries.

Other issues, such as preserving communities of interest in terms of rural representation, can also be something the Legislature considers as more important than exact population equality and use that as a factor to justify deviations in population that may be greater than precise equality.

When the special masters drew the maps in 2011, one of the factors they were prioritizing above all others was population equality. The districts may have been less compact in order to ensure the population was as equal as possible.

That is not a mandatory duty upon the Legislature. The Legislature can choose to take the other approach and maybe allow for more population inequality so long as it is within constitutional limits in order to prioritize other factors. Factors such as preserving communities of interest, keeping political geography intact, preserving the cores of prior districts and other such matters.

SENATOR DONATE:

Within the last few months, we have heard from various communities of interest about how they have been left behind in the process, especially during 2011.

We were made aware, in the Interim Committee to Conduct an Investigation into Matters Relating to Reapportionment and Redistricting meeting, that there was a concern of a particular indigenous community being split in half into two different districts. Based on S.B. 1, can you clarify or confirm that the Walker River Paiute Tribe is no longer split?

MS. PROEHL:

I can confirm that the Walker River Reservation is not split in the Senate and Assembly proposals. I do not want to comment on the congressional proposal until I can get a better look at it because I do not have the exact boundaries in front of me. I know it is somewhere along the Lyon County and Churchill County boundary lines.

SENATOR DONATE:

That is fine. I just wanted to make sure that was corrected on the Senate and the Assembly maps.

Under these proposals, does rural Nevada lose any Senate or Assembly seats?

MR. STEWART:

In 2011, there were 4 districts in the Senate plan that included groupings of rural counties. In the Assembly plan, there were 6 districts included in groupings of rural counties. So, there were 4 in the Senate plan in 2011 and 2021. For the Assembly, there were 6 in 2011 and 2021 that included rural groupings. Those exact boundaries, obviously, are different, but those would be considered rural groupings.

SENATOR DONATE:

In east Las Vegas, HOAs are not very common. However, HOAs are not considered political units or subdivisions. Is that correct? My understanding is that HOAs are classified as private real-estate entities.

MR. KILLIAN:

Homeowner Associations are not political subdivisions of the State. They are not government organizations in any form. They are a type of private association authorized under State law, but they are not a governmental entity.

ASSEMBLYMAN LEAVITT:

On the Racial Data Report, [Exhibit G](#), page 2, it appears that the Hispanic or Latino districts with 40 percent or more amounted to 7 total. The Asian or Asian with other races over 20 percent was 2 districts. The Black or African American including Black or African American with another races totals 5 districts over 20 percent.

Senate Select Committee on Redistricting and Elections  
Assembly Committee on Select Committee on Redistricting and Elections  
November 13, 2021  
Page 29

How does previous data compare to current demographics regarding Hispanic or Latino plus 40 percent, Asian plus 20 percent and Black and African American plus 20 percent?

MR. STEWART:

Are you referring to the Assembly proposal in S.B. 1?

ASSEMBLYMAN LEAVITT:

Yes, I am.

MR. STEWART:

Do you want us to look at anything over 40 percent?

ASSEMBLYMAN LEAVITT:

Over 40 percent in Hispanic and Latino, over 20 percent in Asian and over 20 percent in Black and African American.

As I was looking at the maps, it appears that Inspirada, which is entirely in my district, has been split into proposed Assembly Districts 23, 36 and 41 and into proposed Senate Districts 12, 19 and 20, [Exhibit D](#), page 2. Am I looking at that right?

MS. PROEHL:

I would need to overlay those to get a better idea of the exact boundaries.

MR. STEWART:

In answer to your question, in 2011 for Hispanic and Latino, there were 7 Assembly Districts over 40 percent, and for 2021, there are 6 districts. In the Asian category, those over 20 percent in 2011 were 3 Assembly Districts and in 2021, S.B. 1 proposes 3 Assembly Districts as well. In the Black and African American category, in 2011, 3 Assembly Districts were over 20 percent and S.B. 1 proposes 5 Assembly Districts in 2021.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN HANSEN:

I want to refer back to the submission from Senator Seevers Gansert on the NCSL traditional redistricting principles used by many states, [Exhibit I](#), page 1, particularly the preservation of counties and other political subdivisions and the preservation of communities of interest.

I am more than glad to answer the question about a large district. I am honored to represent 38,000 square miles, 7 counties as it now stands. Even though I have loved doing that, the proposed Assembly District 33 is much larger than it is now.

From 2016 to 2020, the fuel cost to travel those miles was half of what it is now. Those miles are not traveled on State dollars. It is a burden, but it is one I gladly bear and that I know I signed up for. In the district I represent, Assembly District 32, the proposed map splits 8 counties. Two of the 7 counties I represent were split. As proposed, I go to 6 counties, and it splits into 4 counties. Overall, the new proposed maps split 8 counties.

I am curious, and, again, this is a rhetorical question that I know you cannot answer, however, for the record and for the communities that are concerned, why are we splitting a community such as Carlin? Carlin is a community of interest when we look at employment. We are splitting the employees from the communities in which they work from the communities in which they live.

Carlin has been pulled away from the City of Elko. Elko County is split, and Carlin has been split off from that representation to proposed Assembly District 32 which has historically been Assembly District 33. This is a concern.

Elko County prefers to keep its community of interest. Anyone who has visited that area knows how important that community of interest is to the region. I am hoping we will hear from them when we get to testimony. There is quite a deviation from keeping communities of interest whole and keeping counties whole to the degree that we can in a state as large as ours.

What is the definition, criteria or percentage for competitiveness? Can that be obtained for the last 10 or 20 years? Would we be able to compile the average percentage to determine what makes a district a swing district? Is it 4 percent? Is it 10 percent? Is there a way for us to get a number from LCB?

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

I am not sure that is a question for the presenters or for legal.

MR. KILLIAN:

On the legal side of the question, there is no legal requirement in Nevada for competitiveness to be a factor that is considered. There is no legal standard as to what constitutes a competitive district versus a noncompetitive district. In other states that use competitiveness as a criteria, it is typically expressed in a "squishy" way. As many districts as possible should be drawn so that electoral results may change from year to year, but most states do not apply any particular percentage to that. That said, as a research request, there is value to what you are asking for. From a legal perspective, there is not necessarily any percentage tied to that concept.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN HANSEN:

From the point of view of research, it would be helpful to the populace to know historically what a swing district is. Where has that been occurring in Nevada elections?

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Now that the maps have been generated, it is unfortunate that the redistricting Committee members met in Fallon, and not Elko as originally planned, and did not get to make that drive and realize what 350 miles to Carlin looks like.

SENATOR SEEVERS GANSERT:

We had some conversations about compactness. We may be able to get an index that addresses compactness. However, on the map I submitted labeled "2011 Senate Districts (purple outline) vs. Joint Majority Senate Districts (color fill)", ([Exhibit J](#)), the purple line outlines what Senate District 15 currently is. It covers the western half of the City of Reno which includes the communities of interest and political subdivisions within the City of Reno of Somersett, part of Verdi and Cold Springs. The purple line on the western side in the close-up of Senate Districts 14 and 15 is the current district which is very compact and includes the political subdivision of the City of Reno. Within the area that is now blue, which is part of Senate District 14, is Somersett, Verdi and Cold Springs. When you talk about compactness, normally that area would be associated with Senate District 15; but in the proposed district, it is not.

We may have a ratio later, but we have to also be able to pass the visual test and the distance test. The west side of Reno has been carved out and added to Senate District 14 which extends all the way to Carlin. If you were to try to

drive from Verdi, the most western part of the City of Reno and Nevada, to Carlin, according to MapQuest, that is 278 miles. Carlin to Salt Lake City is 252 miles. The point is that this is not a compact district. This is a district that has been severed. The City of Reno has been severed. The visual shows overall compactness of all of the districts and is clearer than some indexes we will look at.

A piece of this political subdivision known as Reno has been divided in these maps. It is important to note there is no compactness there.

MR. STEWART:

A question was asked about who referenced maps during our four public hearings in October. I missed a name, Eli Trimble, who testified and referenced some maps that he submitted on the MyDistricting application.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

The Committee will now take public comment.

MICHAEL KELLY:

I support S.B. 1, as a veteran, and as the districts are drawn. For the first time, veterans see an opportunity for better representation. The previous maps were not supportive of veterans and did not give us an opportunity as a special group to be heard and to be represented. These new maps allow us greater representation and greater support. I hope that we, as veterans, will take advantage of this and continue to participate in the democratic process.

ANNA VILLATORO (Children's Advocacy Alliance):

The Children's Advocacy Alliance (CAA) is neutral on S.B. 1. We are an independent voice for Nevada's families and children. We are dedicated to advancing public policy in the areas of child safety, health, school readiness and economic well-being. We create lasting change by tackling the biggest issues our kids and families face.

As you are aware, children are included in the total population in these proposed legislative districts. Although they cannot vote, they will be impacted by these district maps for the next ten years.



We have submitted a document ([Exhibit K](#)) highlighting the percentage of children in each proposed legislative district in S.B. 1. We ask you to consider how to prioritize the needs of children in each district in Nevada. We encourage you to reach out to community groups, families, parents and children to learn more. Even though children cannot vote, they deserve a voice and champions at the Legislature.

ANDRE WADE (State Director, Silver State Equality):

Silver State Equality is neutral on S.B. 1. Silver State Equality is a statewide LGBTQ+ civil rights organization and is a member of the Nevadans Count Coalition working on redistricting.

Public education has been a challenge for us given the truncated process in this Special Session. Any maps that are passed will be in effect for the next ten years. It is imperative to ensure that these maps are reflective of our communities regardless of political affiliation.

As the State's population grows, diversity grows. It would be great if we could see that diversity reflected in elected officials. More importantly, these elected officials should keep the unique needs of our communities in mind through their representation.

This is not about partisan politics. This is about voices being heard. Voices cannot be heard if we, as a coalition, cannot have our maps uploaded without technical issues. I can imagine what it must be like for the layperson who is trying to be engaged in the process and is having technical issues. Overall, the lack of community input is a concern during the process. We must be mindful of communities of interest. Thank you for your commitment to drawing and passing equitable maps.

QUENTIN SAVVOIR (Deputy Director, Make It Work Nevada):

Make It Work Nevada is also a member of the Nevadans Count Coalition. I am providing neutral testimony on S.B. 1 in gratitude to Governor Steve Sisolak's Office for ensuring that those currently in the throes of the legal system and incarcerated in the Nevada Department of Corrections will be counted in the neighborhoods where their last known address is located.

We appreciate the progress toward making sure that inmates are treated with humanity and dignity because people should be counted in their communities even though they have made a transgression. Much more work should be done on these maps to ensure there is ample community input.

EMILY PERSAUD-ZAMORA (Silver State Voices):

I never imagined that I would be testifying in opposition to S.B. 1. It is important to me and to the many organizations and community members that we have been listening to for the last year. However, we are here because at the end of the day, we must put community first.

Our diverse coalition worked last year with many individuals teaching them about the census, the importance of the census, why they need to fill it out and the impacts of connecting it to the issue of redistricting. We have heard overwhelmingly from community members that they are not happy about this process. They are not happy about the end result of the maps, especially with congressional districts.

Our diverse coalition of community members have drawn a map ensuring that communities of interest are kept together and adequately represented and does not mix dramatically different income levels and populations with competing interests. These voices must be taken into consideration in the discussions had today at the Legislature when you cast your final vote.

Contrary to popular belief, we do not represent or support any party. We are not here for the Democratic Party or the Republican Party. We are here for what is best for our community. These maps are separating many of our communities of interest.

Since we had trouble uploading our maps to the Legislative website, we will print them out and provide them as an exhibit for Legislators to see.

Nevada is the third most diverse state in the Nation. It is imperative that the voices representing these communities of interest are empowered within the process and that our elected officials take their feedback and concerns seriously. The outcome of the Thirty-third Special Session will determine Nevada's voting districts for the next decade, making this a cannot-miss

opportunity to ensure that all elected officials understand and answer to the needs of our communities.

Our second graders are going to be voting in these districts, and we have a responsibility to them to ensure that we are hearing their voices today.

PAULA LUNA:

I am testifying as a constituent living in Congressional District 1. I oppose S.B. 1. I am a Latina, and I live in a largely Latinx area. I am concerned that the proposed map for Congressional District 1 will divide us, and as a result, diminish my community's ability to engage in their government.

We are a community of interest, of shared interests, and we deserve a seat at the table on this issue. We share bilingual and bicultural characteristics. We have children who attend the same schools. Many of us are employed in the same work sectors. The community even has culturally and linguistically appropriate nonprofit organizations.

It is important that this Committee ensures that all communities of interest are taken into consideration in the redistricting process and that our input is actively taken into account and taken seriously. We need to ensure that our needs are understood and that we are fairly represented. The proposed redrawing of Congressional District 1 would break up the Latinx communal area. I do not want to see that.

This is a nonpartisan issue about a community of people who should be listened to and who have concerns. I want to see my community together, as we have been, guaranteeing our voices will not be drowned out and that our needs will not be ignored. Please take a look at and consider the map proposed by the Nevadans Count Coalition. This map was actually drawn with the input from our community. Please vote no on S.B. 1 and go back to the drawing board.

VINSON GUTHREAU (Executive Director, Nevada Association of Counties):  
I have submitted written testimony opposing S.B. 1, ([Exhibit L](#)).

TAYLOR PATTERSON (Executive Director, Native Voters Alliance Nevada):

I am a member of the Bishop Paiute Tribe. I am here to encourage the Committee to listen to the feedback of the Black, Indigenous and people of color organizers.

Many tribal communities have been split in many ways. While some of these issues have been addressed, others have not. The Reno-Sparks Indian Colony and the Walker River Paiute Tribe are being divided into multiple congressional districts. Some of these issues come down to the fact that we cannot always rely on mapping systems to have the correct boundaries of reservation lands. All of this could have been avoided by doing appropriate tribal consultation.

Unfortunately, it is nearly impossible for communities to give their feedback on these maps. The software used by the Legislature is slow, antiquated and difficult to use. The computer system is not an issue; internet access is. Many of our rural tribal communities do not have reliable internet access. If community members cannot create maps and submit feedback, this process will not be successful. Our communities have to live with these maps for the next ten years. We need to get this right the first time.

CHRISTINE SAUNDERS (Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada):

The Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada is a member of Nevadans Count Coalition.

Redistricting only happens every ten years, shaping the future for how our communities are represented for some time to come. The 2020 census data showed how the U.S. population has changed over the last decade and that Black, Indigenous, Asian American and Pacific Islander and Latinx populations have driven that change.

This was especially true for Nevada, as it is now the third most diverse state in the Nation. We cannot ignore the fact of how much our State grew over the past decade and how much more diverse it is now. Doing so runs the risk of losing community voices at a time when it is most crucial to increase them. Therefore, we must get this right and ensure that Nevadans are equitably represented and able to elect representatives of their choice.

I echo the sentiments of my southern Nevada colleagues that the Latinx vote must not be overly divided and that low-income communities should not be diluted so they can be fairly represented.

As for the northern part of the State, a few minor changes will benefit the community. As drawn in the proposed Senate and Assembly maps, Sun Valley has been split. Other jurisdictions in northern Nevada have worked to make this community whole, and the Legislature should also.

In addition, the boundary at the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) should be moved further to the west to Washington Street to ensure that all of the student housing and students who live nearby are included in the campus.

We hope you listen to the feedback from the communities of interest and make these changes on the maps before moving them forward.

BENJAMIN CHALLINOR (Faith in Action Nevada):

Faith in Action Nevada is a member of Nevadans Count Coalition, and we oppose S.B. 1.

I represent faith leaders, community leaders and people of good will. Once these maps are approved, they are set for ten years. These maps set who represents our communities in an elected office. It is important that those who represent these communities look like the communities and understand their unique needs.

However, the lasting effects are not limited to ten years. The policies implemented by elected officials during these years will have affects on generations to come. That is why it is extremely important to make sure that districts truly represent our communities, and they keep our communities whole.

I echo the sentiments from previous Nevadans Count Coalition members, especially those sentiments about northern Nevada. Sun Valley is split into three districts. The Neil Road area will be split into two different districts. I would like to see that in one single district.

ANNETTE MAGNUS (Executive Director, Battle Born Progress):

Battle Born Progress opposes S.B. 1 for a few reasons. One is dividing communities of interest and putting competing income levels, municipalities and interests together in some of these maps which would create layers of issues.

Because of the technical difficulties encountered in uploading our map, which addresses the issues of communities of interest and income levels from our perspective, I am concerned that many Nevadans were prevented from having their voices heard. The technology infrastructure that is being used to process public input is not configured properly to accept complex maps. The server tasked with the processing of shapefiles simply does not have enough memory allocated to process more complex geometries. The program simply stops working in the background, giving Nevadans trying to use their voice no indication of what the problem is in uploading their maps. How many Nevadans were prevented from having their voice heard because of this issue?

This should be a nonpartisan process and not a time for partisan bickering. Our arguments are not about one party over the other. Contrary to popular belief, we do not work for any party. We side with reality and the community in this issue. Our arguments are about listening to the communities you should be serving over special interests.

You can have as many public meetings as you want, but if you do not take communities' comments into consideration, it does not actually mean anything.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN ROBIN L. TITUS (Assembly District No. 38):

I am not here to comment on the proposed Senate or Assembly maps. We have heard many comments on those today. I am here as someone who has an interest in Smith Valley. A member of my family has continuously lived in Smith Valley since 1888.

I ask that you look at the proposed Democrat congressional maps, [Exhibit B](#), page 1. Can you even see a little piece of pink that has been removed from that map which is just one side of the street where I live? It has been separated from the rest of Smith Valley, the tractor dealer, the little bar in my community and the houses on the other side of the street. I had to blow that up in my map to emphasize how ridiculous it is that this little chunk was separated from Smith Valley.

Many have heard me complain about the Congressional District 4 division over the past ten years because we felt we were not really represented. We were separated from Wabuska, which is a geographic railroad. All of Mason Valley and Smith Valley was moved down to Congressional District 4. We have lived with that for the last ten years. My representative from Congressional District 4 has not been in my community of Smith Valley.

When these maps were redrawn, we were hoping we were all either going to be moved up to Congressional District 2 or left where we were so at least we had a couple of valleys in which we were together. We were all shocked when we saw this new map.

I know they did not draw this line deliberately to remove my house and leave me in Congressional District 4 and give everyone else to Congressional District 2. How was this map drawn? No one here is taking any ownership of it because someone was hired to do it, and nobody can ask that person questions. This congressional map is as egregious as anything I have ever seen to remove and split a community of interest.

ELI TRIMBLE:

I submitted some proposed maps and spoke to the Interim Committee to Conduct an Investigation into Matters Relating to Reapportionment and Redistricting. During that meeting, I specifically pointed out Senate District 14 as being a problem. It is the district in which I reside. It is atrocious that the district stretches for more than 200 miles. Now Senate District 14, once again, stretches for 200 miles in the other direction. Therefore, I cannot support these maps. They continue the theme we have been seeing of urban and suburban areas being coupled with rural areas completely unnecessarily.

As I look at the county splits, especially in the rural counties, there is no reason to have this many split rural counties. I ask the Legislature to please review my proposed Senate and Assembly plans. Overall, there are some good aspects to these plans.

As far as the congressional maps are concerned, it is disappointing to see that not one congressional district has a Hispanic majority. It is possible to draw a Hispanic majority district, and it boggles my mind that the Legislature is choosing not to do so.

ALONDRA FLORES:

We need maps that keep our communities together and can give us representation that understands our needs. I am asking you to consider new maps that truly represent Latinos.

EDUARDO ALVAREZ:

I oppose the maps. Latinos deserve better representation, and these maps do the exact opposite.

YVETTE WILLIAMS:

I have submitted my written testimony in opposition to S.B. 1, ([Exhibit M](#)).

CLAUDIA MORALES:

I am opposed to the proposed maps. Latinos contribute so much to Nevada, and we are not appreciated and respected. The Latino community has suffered so much in the last two years with immigration and COVID-19, and now you are trying to take away our community. Please draw maps that will represent Latinos. We will hold you accountable for this during the 2022 midterm elections.

GUILLERMO BARAHONA (Civic Engagement Director, Chispa Nevada):

Chispa Nevada partners with Nevadans Count Coalition, and we are opposed to S.B. 1. From the school board, to the Interim Committee to Conduct an Investigation into Matters Relating to Reapportionment and Redistricting, county commission and city council meetings, community members have been urging our elected officials to put communities of interest first, which means having meaningful public input.

To put it into perspective, it means providing community members with an ample amount of time to look at the proposed maps, allowing them to provide their feedback and actually incorporating their feedback. That also means the platform must be accessible where this Committee is asking everyday Nevadans to post their proposed maps. However, if Nevadans cannot post their proposed maps due to technical difficulties, how can we expect them to do so?

Redistricting happens once every ten years. The decision this Committee will make will drastically affect our communities. It is important to incorporate their feedback.



Senate Select Committee on Redistricting and Elections  
Assembly Committee on Select Committee on Redistricting and Elections  
November 13, 2021  
Page 41

DOUG BUSSELMAN:

I oppose the maps. Yesterday, I filed comments on the maps taking exception to the way that three rural counties were split up where county lines could have been followed more appropriately. I urge that to be done going forward. I was also concerned about the way in which Pahrump has been divided into different districts.

I was not able to find information for this meeting or the exhibits online so I am not sure where we are in terms of what maps we are actually working with at this point. I hope that changes can be made so citizens might be able to easily access information and comment on current considerations.

ASSEMBLYMAN JOHN C. ELLISON (Assembly District No. 33):

I oppose the maps as presented. There are alternate maps out there that should have been considered or discussed, which is not happening.

Two districts in Elko County will be split in two. We have many challenges in rural Nevada. If I want to visit the town of Midas, I have to go all the way through Winnemucca to get there. If I want to visit Tuscarora, I have to go up through Wild Horse on dirt roads to get there. To get to Jarbidge, I either have to go up to the Idaho border or go up through Charleston. Then there are the rural towns such as Jackpot, Wendover, Carlin and Ely.

Elko County Commission Chair Jon Karr, Commissioner Rex Steninger and Commissioner Cliff Eklund are all trying to call into this meeting but cannot get through. I ask you to reconsider some of the boundaries in the proposed maps and consider the proposed alternate maps.

I do not know how my Senator in Senate District 19 has made all of those trips all of these years to those areas. I do not know how many thousands of miles he puts on his vehicle a year. It is pretty rough. My district is rough. Do not accept the maps as presented.

ASSEMBLYMAN PHILLIP P.K. O'NEILL (Assembly District No. 40):

I was not planning on speaking today, but I was listening to the discussion and several times I heard a statement similar to "I can't quite tell from the map ..." and then they went on to describe an issue they had with these shapefile picture maps.

Senate Select Committee on Redistricting and Elections  
Assembly Committee on Select Committee on Redistricting and Elections  
November 13, 2021  
Page 42

Assembly District No. 40 includes all of Carson City and the southeast part of Washoe County. *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 218B.795 describes the constraints of Assembly District 40, and it gives specific definitions of what Assembly District 40 is. Please give me descriptions, particularly in the northern parts of Assembly District 40, of what roads and boundaries are included or defined in Assembly District 40.

We are dumbing down NRS. We are making NRS a comic book of pictures. No longer are our State's statutes words; they are pictures. I think back to just last Session when I had a bill that was describing some warnings. I had to give, not a picture, but descriptions of font and size, inches and centimeters for what those warnings would be. Now, for redistricting, which we will live by for the next ten years, we will describe with shapefile picture maps. That is an insult to Nevada, its citizens and the districts themselves.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JILL DICKMAN (Assembly District No. 31):  
The minority party has an amendment that LCB staff would like to present.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MILLER:  
Mr. Stewart from LCB will present the proposed amendment.

MR. STEWART:  
We have been asked to provide factual information regarding the reapportionment and redistricting plans proposed by the Senate and Assembly Minority Party members as part of their requested amendment to S.B. 1 of the Thirty-third Special Session.

Again, I must disclose that as central and nonpartisan staff, we cannot advocate for the passage or defeat of any legislation or, in this case, any reapportionment and redistricting proposal or any amendments, thereto. We are here to present only basic, factual information found in the redistricting proposal before you for the Committee's review as requested in this amendment. The proposal sets forth redistricting plans for the U.S. House of Representatives, the Nevada State Senate and the Nevada State Assembly. As mentioned earlier, we will not be able to answer questions relating to the rationale of why a district boundary may, or may not, have been drawn one way or the other, as these were decisions made by the authors of the proposed amendments.

MS. PROEHL:

Starting with the congressional plan, Nevada has four congressional seats. The proposed map amendments establishes four distinct geographical districts, ([Exhibit N](#)), pages 1 and 2. Congressional District 2 is in northern Nevada and Congressional District 4 contains central Nevada and parts of Clark County surrounding the Las Vegas Valley, including Henderson and Boulder City. Congressional Districts 1 and 3 are wholly contained within Clark County. Congressional District 3 contains western parts of the Las Vegas core and extends down to the southern tip of the State. Congressional District 1 contains some of the Las Vegas core, North Las Vegas and extends north into more rural parts of Clark County, [Exhibit N](#), page 2.

Except for Clark County, Churchill County and Lyon County are the only counties divided in the congressional plan and that is on Congressional Districts' 2 and 4 borders.

MS. STEINLE:

For the congressional plan, the four congressional districts have nearly even population, 776,153 for Congressional Districts 1 and 2 and 776,154 for Congressional Districts 3 and 4 ([Exhibit O](#)), page 1.

The ideal population is calculated by dividing the number of districts into the total State population. Thus, 3,104,614 divided by 4 is 776,153.5. Therefore, due to rounding, the deviation numbers are -0.50 for Congressional Districts 1 and 2 and 0.50 for Congressional Districts 3 and 4. By adding the largest positive deviation to the largest negative deviation, the result is an overall range of deviation of 1 which is 0.00 percent.

MR. STEWART:

Turning to the Racial Data Report high-percentage districts, [Exhibit O](#), page 2, in the White Alone category, Congressional District 2 has 67.65 percent.

In the Black or African American, including Black or African American with another race or races category, the high district is Congressional District 1 with 21.12 percent.

The high district for American Indian and Alaskan Native, including American Indian and Alaskan Native with another race or races, is Congressional District 2 with 4.90 percent.

The high district for Asian, including Asian with another race or races category is Congressional District 3 with 20.11 percent.

For Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander, including Hawaiian and Pacific Islander with another race or races category, the high district is Congressional District 3 with 2.45 percent.

In the Some Other Race Alone category, the high district is Congressional District 1 with 26.56 percent.

In the Two or More Races category, the high district is Congressional District 1 with 16.85 percent.

The high district in the Hispanic or Latino of any race is Congressional District 1 with 47.64 percent.

MS. PROEHL:

The proposed amendment for the Senate plan maps establishes 21 Senate districts ([Exhibit P](#)), pages 1, 2 and 3. Fifteen of those districts are wholly within Clark County. Five are in western Nevada, including two wholly within Washoe County and one which includes the eastern part of the State and parts of Clark County.

In addition to Clark County and Washoe County, four counties are divided among Senate districts in the proposed amendment plan. They are Churchill County, Lyon County, Nye County and Storey County.

All Assembly districts are nested within Senate districts for this proposed amendment. One Senate district wholly contains two Assembly districts. Those pairings can be found in the amendment proposed for the Senate District tables ([Exhibit Q](#)), page 1.

MS. STEINLE:

The ideal population for the 21-district Senate amendment plan is 147,839, [Exhibit Q](#), page 1. In this plan, the largest positive deviation is in Senate District 16 at 561 which is 0.38 percent, the largest negative deviation is in Senate District 17 at -829 which is -0.56 percent. The overall range of deviation is 1,390 which is 0.94 percent.

MR. STEWART:

Looking at the Racial Data Report, [Exhibit Q](#), page 2, for the Senate plan proposed amendment, I will highlight the high-percentage districts for each category.

In the White Alone category, the high Senate Districts are 15, 16, 17 and 19. The percentages range from 68.73 percent to 77.40 percent.

The high districts for Black or African American, including Black or African American with another race or races, are Senate Districts 1, 4 and 10 with a range of 17.82 percent to 28.49 percent.

For American Indian and Alaskan Native, the high Senate Districts are 13, 14, 17 and 19 ranging from 4.38 percent to 6.43 percent.

For Asian including Asian with another race or races, the high Senate Districts are 8, 9, 11 and 20 ranging from 18.51 percent to 28.02 percent.

For Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander, the high Senate Districts are 5, 9, 11 and 20 ranging from 2.39 percent to 2.79 percent.

For Some Other Race Alone, the high Senate Districts are 2, 3, 4, 10 and 21 ranging from 21.21 percent to 39.09 percent.

For Two or More Races, a broad disbursement ranges from a low in Senate District 17 of 10.68 percent to a high in Senate District 2 of 17.39 percent.

Finally, in the Hispanic or Latino category, the high Senate Districts are 2, 3, 4, 7, 10 and 21 with a range of 35.99 percent to a high of 63.45 percent.

MS. PROEHL:

For the Assembly plan maps, the amendment would establish 42 Assembly districts ([Exhibit R](#)), pages 1, 2 and 3. Thirty districts are wholly within Clark County. Assembly District 36 is mostly within Clark County but also extends into Nye County, [Exhibit R](#), page 2. There are 10 Assembly districts, 6 of which are completely within Washoe County. Assembly District 33 contains the eastern part of the State and extends from Elko County down to Lincoln County, [Exhibit R](#), page 3.

In addition to Clark County and Washoe County, the other counties split among Assembly districts include Churchill County, Lyon County, Nye County and Storey County.

These Assembly districts nest within the Senate districts.

MS. STEINLE:

The ideal population for the 42-district Assembly plan amendment is 73,919 ([Exhibit S](#)), page 1. In this plan, the largest positive deviation is in Assembly District 40 at 368 which is 0.50 percent, and the largest negative deviation is in Assembly District 38 at -415 which is 0.56 percent. Therefore, the overall range of deviation is 783 which is 1.06 percent.

MR. STEWART:

Turning to the Racial Data Report, [Exhibit S](#), page 2, I will highlight the high-percentage districts in each category in the proposed amendment.

The high-percentage districts for the White Alone category are Assembly Districts 23, 25, 26, 28, 32, 33, 38, 39 and 40, ranging from 70.76 percent to 80.25 percent.

The high-percentage districts for Black or African American are Assembly Districts 1, 6, 7, 16 and 17 ranging from 21.96 percent to 30.00 percent.

The high-percentage districts for American Indian and Alaskan Native are Assembly Districts 32, 33, 38 and 40 ranging from 4.84 percent to 8.90 percent.

The high-percentage districts for Asian, including Asian with another race or races, are Assembly Districts 5, 8, 9, 35, 41 and 42 with a range of 20.15 percent to 34.90 percent.

For Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander, the high-percentage districts are Assembly Districts 1, 35 and 41 with a range of 2.50 percent to 3.98 percent.

For Some Other Race Alone, the high-percentage districts are Assembly Districts 3, 6, 7, 10, 11, 14, 15 and 28 with a range from 25.18 percent to 41.24 percent.

For Two or More Races, the high-percentage districts range from Assembly District 39 at 9.96 percent to Assembly District 18 to 17.52 percent.

For Hispanic or Latino, those high districts are Assembly Districts 3, 6, 7, 11, 14, 15 and 28 with a range from 45.62 percent to 66.14 percent.

LUCE:

I represent many Latinos who have worked for a long time and have always worked to better themselves for the community and to get ahead. We want our representatives to represent us properly.

The proposed maps do not represent Latinos. You do not know who we are or what our contributions are. We ask that you do not support the maps because they take away the voices of the Latin Community.

CARLOS REESE:

I am not in agreement with the maps. Please respect our community. We want a district with a majority of Latinos.

REINA REESE:

I oppose the maps. Please respect our voices where the Latinos celebrate who we are, where we feel secure and with representation that works for our community. Do not support the maps that separate us.

ISABELLE:

I am a single Latin mother. I have raised my children alone in Clark County. These maps will affect my family and other families that will be voting in the

future for these same maps. I am asking that the maps permit the Latinos of Nevada to be able to help me and the rest of the Latinos within the next 10 years.

As a mother, I am always looking for ways to pay my bills and pay for my children's education. I am asking that the maps consider Hispanic families and lower-income earners.

I am worried that there are not enough organizations in the community to hear the Hispanic voices regarding the maps. I am asking that more computers and information is available in order to raise our voices and have more information regarding the maps. We are not able to access the maps or to leave comments.

TAMMI TIGER (Las Vegas Indian Center):

We oppose the maps in S.B. 1. The Las Vegas Indian Center organized a team of indigenous youth to collect over 30 communities of interest throughout southern Nevada to ensure our voices would help to shape our future. We echo the concerns raised by the Nevadans Count Coalition.

As a citizen of a tribal nation, one tribe's sovereignty is all tribes' sovereignty. The Nevada Legislature has an opportunity to get this right when it comes to respecting tribal boundaries despite not formally engaging tribes in this process.

We understand that you are trying to use county boundaries, but tribal boundaries are set by federal law which should take precedence across all other jurisdictional boundaries. Tribes have a government-to-government relationship which starts with the federal government. When tribes reach out to their representatives on issues regarding public lands or reservation lands, they reach out to their U.S. Senators and U.S. Congress Representatives. That is where it starts.

Please review your current districts and reconsider those maps that cross tribal lands.

DARIELYS RODRIGUEZ:

According to the 2020 U.S. Census, Nevada added 404,000 residents with about 4 out of 10, or 161,000, new Nevadans identifying as Latinx. Overall, Nevada's Latinx population share stands at 29 percent. The Citizen Voting Age



Population by Race and Ethnicity (CVAP) is 25 percent. Latinx is now the largest minority group in Nevada. According to the PEW Research Center, Latinx comprised 20 percent of Nevada's electorate in 2020.

Instead of the Latinx community gaining political voice, the proposed redistricting congressional map has decreased the political power of the Latinx community. In no single congressional district do Latinx achieve more than 32 percent CVAP share.

Most concerning is that in 2011, Congressional District 1 was redrawn to be 45-percent Latinx and 35-percent Caucasian. In 2021, Congressional District 1 would be 35-percent Latinx and 45-percent Caucasian. Congressional District 1 has been the seat that has traditionally best represented the substantive interest of the Latinx community at the federal level. Now, the proposed 2021 congressional map decreases Latinx voting power by splitting the east-west Las Vegas community into three congressional districts. Congressional Districts 1, 3 and 4.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 requires that whenever possible, map drawers create districts where a cohesive and distinct minority group can elect a candidate of their choice. It is possible to draw Congressional District 1 with 50-percent Latinx population and is legally defensible. However, every community of interest should be fairly represented in a manner which reflects their political preferences. Congressional District 1 should total 40-percent to 50-percent Latinx representation. Congressional District 4 would maintain its majority/minority character, and Congressional District 3 should retain a Latinx voter population that can influence policy.

Several alternative proposals have been submitted to the Nevada Legislature to accomplish these goals. Congressional District 1 is currently drawn as a working class, immigrant and largely Latinx community where the median income is \$30,000 to \$40,000. The new map reconstitutes Congressional District 1 so it now absorbs the Henderson suburbs of Green Valley, Anthem, MacDonald Ranch and Seven Hills. It adds Boulder City and rural Clark County up to the Arizona border. The more populace Henderson suburbs are exclusive communities where voters are college educated and family incomes are in excess of \$100,000.

Senate Select Committee on Redistricting and Elections  
Assembly Committee on Select Committee on Redistricting and Elections  
November 13, 2021  
Page 50

IMER CESBEDES:

I oppose the proposed maps. As a Latino, these maps are sending a message to the Latino community that they are not wanted in one district. Please make sure the maps represent Latinos in Congressional District 1. This is another form of separation.

CHARISSE GRESS:

I am opposed to the proposed maps. Latinos do not support maps that separate us. For once, listen to Latinos and vote no on the proposed maps.

SYLVIA LAZOS:

I also oppose the congressional redistricting maps as proposed. We were able to upload maps successfully this morning onto the Legislative website. They are map numbers 741 and 748 and are viable alternatives that present the Nevada Legislature with a win-win situation.

Map 741 is based on the old Congressional District 1 and would increase Latino representation to 40 percent. Map 748 would increase Latino representation to 42 percent.

The Latino and working-class communities of Congressional District 1 are saying that there is such a joining of disparate communities that the working-class community would no longer be heard as clearly as before in the proposed congressional maps.

In both maps, 741 and 748, a substantial portion of the Green Valley, Anthem Community, MacDonald Ranch, all affluent suburbs, would no longer be part of Congressional District 1. So, please consider these maps for adoption.

ISSIS JULIAO:

I oppose the proposed maps. They do not represent Latinos. If you support them, you do not represent us, and you need to be removed from office.

JON KARR (Chairman, Elko County Commission):

I agree with your callers to keep districts whole whether they be a Latino community or a rural community. This would be better for the interests of all of the citizens of Nevada. That is what I want to emphasize to the Senate and Assembly. It is critical for communities to remain whole, a whole county or a

Senate Select Committee on Redistricting and Elections  
Assembly Committee on Select Committee on Redistricting and Elections  
November 13, 2021  
Page 51

whole city to remain as one so they can have a say. Rural communities are a minority group in our population and to have that voice is critical.

People are having problems seeing the maps. I hope you pause and rethink this and hear the voices of Nevada. Please keep communities whole.

BEV STENEHJEM:

I am a resident of Somersett, and I agree with the other callers. We would like to keep our community whole. I am against the redistricting as proposed.

AMY KOO (Asian Community Development Council):

The Asian Community Development Council (ACDC) is neutral on S.B. 1.

Between the 2010 and 2020 U.S. censuses, Nevada's Asian American and Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander (AANHPI) community has grown more than 45 percent. The majority of the growth has taken place in southwest Las Vegas.

Nevada is one of only 6 states where the AANHPI community makes up more than 10 percent of the State's population. There are 12.5 percent or over 389,000 Asian and Pacific Islanders residing in Nevada.

The ACDC worked collaboratively with the Nevadans Count Coalition last year to ensure a complete count while also combatting misinformation and scare tactics about the proposed addition of a citizenship question that was meant to harm our community. During the months leading up to redistricting, we held community meetings to gather input on the proposed district maps and learn about places of interest in China Town, Asia Town, Spring Mountain corridor, Enterprise and southwest regions.

We trained community members to draw district maps and encouraged them to submit their own maps to the Legislative website. However, it was incredibly difficult to submit these maps correctly. This has disenfranchised members of our community from having their voices heard.

While the proposed map by the Senate and Assembly Majority Party members is in line with the long-term empowerment of the growing AANHPI community in Nevada, we do not want that opportunity to come at the expense of other

communities of interest. We urge the Committee to keep communities of interest at the forefront of the discussion while considering these maps. We support the maps submitted by the Nevadans Count Coalition because this is an equitable representation of the community.

CHRIS ROMAN:

I oppose S.B. 1. I ask you to please reconsider and ensure that Latino voters, and the community as a whole, are not diluted or in any way diminished in terms of its influence. Latinos contribute, as does everyone else, in every field of endeavor. A functioning and productive society should encourage participation by Latinos and other groups.

CAROL FINEBERG:

I live in the Del Webb portion of Somersett in northwest Reno. I am opposed to this proposed redistricting. The maps are hard to read online. It was not until I heard from my Senator and my Assembly representative that I learned about the disaster that could result from these proposed maps.

We are a homogenous neighborhood in all of Somersett, and now you are breaking us up and putting us with rural communities in Elko. That is unbelievable and completely disconnected from Reno where we live. It is unrepresented and disenfranchised. Please reconsider and go back to the drawing board on the redistricting.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 1 and go on to public comment.

MR. CHALLINOR:

I understand it is sometimes difficult to ensure you line up the proper translation services. I hope that in the future, whether a regular session or a special session, we find the right way to ensure that any community member has the ability to come speak in their own voice.

MS. MAGNUS:

As a communicator, it is important to not disenfranchise Latino voters. Their translated voices should be heard accurately because a Latino district is going to be split up.

Senate Select Committee on Redistricting and Elections  
Assembly Committee on Select Committee on Redistricting and Elections  
November 13, 2021  
Page 53

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MILLER:

We do hear you, and we are striving for accuracy.

RANDY CASE:

I am a citizen of Carson City. This meeting has been disheartening for me and my family regarding how the government is handling this issue.

We are nonpartisan, and regardless of whether you like the maps or not, there is an overwhelming amount of opposition. It is astounding that this is scheduled to go immediately into work session. I would ask you to go back to the drawing board and consider the needs of your constituents.

KEITH METCALFE:

I am from Carson City and have been listening to the meeting. Unfortunately, what I heard are similar tactics used in the Southern U.S. by a particular political party to put all of the people of color in one district to fuse it and give extraordinary power to the white communities. I would hope that my colleagues in Nevada would understand what they are asking for and what the consequences are.

It is a great map to start with. Probably some corrections could be made around the edges, but by and large, it is a good job. I hope the Majority Party members on the Committee hold true to the intent of the maps and move forward with it.

Remainder of page intentionally left blank; signature page to follow.

Senate Select Committee on Redistricting and Elections  
Assembly Committee on Select Committee on Redistricting and Elections  
November 13, 2021  
Page 54

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

Since that was our last agenda item, the Joint meeting of the Senate Select Committee on Redistricting and Elections and the Assembly Select Committee on Redistricting and Elections is adjourned at 3:12 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Suzanne Efford,  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:



---

Senator James Ohrenschall, Chair

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_



Assemblywoman Brittney Miller, Chair

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>EXHIBIT SUMMARY</b>				
<b>Bill</b>	<b>Exhibit Letter</b>	<b>Begins on Page</b>	<b>Witness / Entity</b>	<b>Description</b>
	A	1		Agenda
S.B. 1	B	1	Michael Stewart, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Congressional Plan District Maps
S.B. 1	C	1	Michael Stewart, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Congressional Plan District Tables
S.B. 1	D	1	Michael Stewart, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Senate Plan District Maps
S.B. 1	E	1	Michael Stewart, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Senate Plan District Tables
S.B. 1	F	1	Michael Stewart, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Assembly Plan District Maps
S.B. 1	G	1	Michael Stewart, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Assembly Plan District Tables
S.B. 1	H	1	Senator Heidi Seevers Gansert	First Judicial District Court Case
S.B. 1	I	1	Senator Heidi Seevers Gansert	National Conference of State Legislatures Redistricting Criteria
S.B. 1	J	1	Senator Heidi Seevers Gansert	2011 Senate Districts vs. Joint Majority Senate Districts
S.B. 1	K	1	Anna Villatorro, Children's Advocacy Alliance	Children's Percentage Table

Senate Select Committee on Redistricting and Elections  
Assembly Committee on Select Committee on Redistricting and Elections  
November 13, 2021  
Page 56

S.B. 1	L	1	Vinson Guthereau, Nevada Association of Counties	Written Testimony
S.B. 1	M	1	Yvette Williams	Written Testimony
S.B. 1	N	1	Haley Proehl, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Proposed Amendment to Congressional District Maps
S.B. 1	O	1	Kathy Steinle, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Proposed Amendment to Congressional District Tables
S.B. 1	P	1	Haley Proehl, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Proposed Amendment to Senate District Maps
S.B. 1	Q	1	Haley Proehl, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Proposed Amendment to Senate District Tables
S.B. 1	R	1	Haley Proehl, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Proposed Amendment to Assembly District Maps
S.B. 1	S		Kathy Steinle, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Proposed Amendments to Assembly District Tables