

**MINUTES OF THE
JOINT MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE
OPERATIONS AND ELECTIONS
AND THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE OPERATIONS AND ELECTIONS**

**Seventy-Sixth Session
May 5, 2011**

The Joint Assembly Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections and the Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections was called to order by Chair Tick Segerblom at 1:58 p.m. on Thursday, May 5, 2011, in Room 4100 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. In addition, the meeting was videoconferenced to Room 124 of the Greenhaw Technical Arts Building, Great Basin College, 1500 College Parkway, Elko, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/76th2011/committees/. In addition, copies of the audio record may be purchased through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775-684-6835).

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Tick Segerblom, Chair
Assemblywoman Lucy Flores, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Marcus Conklin
Assemblyman Richard (Skip) Daly
Assemblyman Pete Goicoechea
Assemblyman Tom Grady
Assemblyman Cresent Hardy
Assemblyman Pat Hickey
Assemblyman William C. Horne
Assemblywoman Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick
Assemblyman Richard McArthur
Assemblyman John Ocegüera
Assemblywoman Debbie Smith
Assemblyman Lynn D. Stewart

SENATE COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator David R. Parks, Chair
Senator Moises (Mo) Denis, Vice Chair
Senator Steven A. Horsford
Senator Barbara K. Cegavske
Senator James A. Settelmeyer

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblyman James Ohrenschall (excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Donald O. Williams, Research Director
Michael J. Stewart, Supervising Principal Research Analyst
Kathy Steinle, GIS Manager, Information Technology Services
Patrick Guinan, Assembly Committee Policy Analyst
Carol Stonefield, Senate Committee Policy Analyst
Eileen O'Grady, Senate Committee Counsel
Kristen Roberts, Committee Counsel
Terry Horgan, Assembly Committee Secretary
Michael Smith, Assembly Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Ed Gobel, representing GoWest Institute
Linda West Myers, representing GoWest Institute
Artie Blanco, Nevada State Director, Mi Familia Vota
Tibi Ellis, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Forrest Darby, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Roxanne McCoy, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Fernando Romero, State Director, Democracy USA; President, Hispanics
in Politics
Hui-Lim Ang, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Jim Cooney, Private Citizen, Elko, Nevada
Dan Musgrove, representing the City of North Las Vegas

Chair Segerblom:

[Roll was taken. Several color maps and accompanying backup information were distributed to Committee members.] This afternoon we are holding hearings on two bill draft requests (BDR). The first BDR contains the redistricting maps proposed by the Democrats for the Assembly, Senate, and congressional districts. Those have been posted on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS). They are also on the Legislative website. The second BDR contains the Republican redistricting maps for the same districts—Assembly, Senate, and Congress. We do not have the Republican BDR, but we should have the Democratic BDR momentarily. Staff has the details behind both of those BDRs, and staff will make the presentation. We will start with the Democratic BDR.

Michael J. Stewart, Supervising Principal Research Analyst:

We have been asked to provide factual information regarding various reapportionment and redistricting plans that have been compiled by both major political parties in the Nevada Legislature.

Before we begin, we have to remind you of our standard Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) disclosure that, as central nonpartisan staff, we cannot advocate for the passage or defeat of any legislation, or in this case, any reapportionment or redistricting plan. We are here today to only present basic factual information about the plans the Chair just discussed. With each plan, Kathy Steinle will give you an explanation of the key geographic components and features of the overall plan and include some district-specific information. I will follow that with a brief summary of statistical information specifically related to population, deviation from the ideal population, and information regarding race and ethnic minority considerations in some of these legislative districts.

With that, I will turn it over to Kathy Steinle, who will begin with the plan prepared by the Democrats for the Nevada State Assembly.

Kathy Steinle, GIS Manager, Information Technology Services:

We will review the maps first, and there will be three maps for each plan type. We have an overall statewide map; a western Nevada, Reno/Sparks, Washoe County-area map; and a Las Vegas/Clark County map.

The first map you see ([Exhibit C](#)) is the Democratic Assembly District plan. In this map, you can see the rural districts fairly well. Thirty districts are wholly in Clark County, and six districts are wholly in Washoe County. Looking at the Reno/Sparks area ([Exhibit D](#)), Districts 24, 25, 27, 30, 31, and 32 are wholly contained in Washoe County.

Moving to Clark County ([Exhibit E](#)), Districts 1 through 23 are wholly contained in Clark County. Districts 28, 29, 34, 37, 39, 41, and 42 also are wholly contained within Clark County. District 26 contains parts of different counties—Carson City, Douglas, Storey, and Washoe. District 33 contains parts of Lincoln as well as all of Elko, Eureka, and White Pine Counties. District 35 has parts of Churchill, Lyon, and Storey Counties; and District 36 has a little bit of Clark, Lincoln, and Nye Counties. District 38 has parts of Churchill, Douglas, Lyon, and Nye Counties and all of Esmeralda, Humboldt, Lander, Mineral, and Pershing Counties. District 40 has parts of Carson City and Douglas, Lyon, and Storey Counties.

Michael Stewart:

[Statistical information for all plans was distributed to Committee members ([Exhibit F](#)).] Turning to the statistical information on this particular plan, we will first look at the population report. As you know, when we perform reapportionment and redistricting, we try to achieve as close to equal population as possible, and all the plans presented today fall within a recognized acceptable overall range of population deviation. Based on the 2010 Census, the ideal population for Assembly districts is 64,299. For this particular plan, the largest positive deviation is 0.75 percent in District 33, and the largest negative deviation is -0.88 in District 35, for an overall range of deviation of 1.62 percent.

In addition to trying to achieve equal population when redistricting, legislatures should try to achieve equitable treatment of minorities. This population report, based on racial and ethnic data, is an important component for you to consider. Looking first at the Hispanic or Latino population, our high districts are 73.17 percent in District 28; 71.22 in District 11; and 54.41 percent in District 19. There are four additional Assembly seats that have Hispanic or Latino populations above 40 percent, and those are Districts 6, 9, 14, and 15.

Considering the black or African American population, District 1 almost achieves 20 percent, and District 6 is at 24.22 percent. In terms of the Asian population, the highest percentage is in Clark District 39 at 26.63 percent. District 8 contains 20.75 percent Asian population.

Kathy Steinle:

We are now going to review the Democratic plan for the Senate districts. The plan has been revised since it was presented in the Committee of the Whole. This is a plan based on the Assembly plan you just saw because they have "nested" the districts. That means that they have taken two Assembly districts and combined them to create one Senate district.

On the statewide map ([Exhibit G](#)), District 19 has all of Carson City as well as parts of Douglas, Lyon, Storey, and Washoe Counties. District 20 contains all of Churchill, Esmeralda, Humboldt, Lander, Mineral, and Pershing Counties as well as parts of Douglas, Lyon, Nye, and Storey Counties. District 21 has all of Elko, Eureka, Lincoln, and White Pine Counties and part of Nye County.

There are three Senate districts wholly contained within Washoe County—Districts 16, 17, and 18 ([Exhibit H](#)). There are 15 Senate districts wholly contained within Clark County—Districts 1 through 15 ([Exhibit I](#)).

Michael Stewart:

Turning to the population data for this plan, the ideal population for a Senate district is 128,598. As I mentioned, these plans fall within an acceptable range of deviation. The largest positive deviation is 0.37 percent in District 18; the largest negative deviation is -0.45 percent in District 20 for an overall deviation of 0.82 percent.

In terms of ethnic and racial data, looking at the Hispanic or Latino population, there are three Senate districts of note. Two are Hispanic majority/minority districts, with 63.77 percent Hispanic in District 2 and 57.02 percent Hispanic in District 10. I would also note that 41.73 percent identified themselves as Hispanic or Latino in District 14.

Moving on to the black or African American population, there are two Senate districts of note. One is District 4, in which 27.62 percent of the population has identified themselves as black or African American. In District 1, 21.2 percent are black or African American. There is a notable Asian population in District 9 of 22.32 percent and in District 11 of 18.37 percent.

Kathy Steinle:

We are now looking at the Democratic congressional plan, and we have the statewide view ([Exhibit J](#)) and the Las Vegas view ([Exhibit K](#)). Two districts are wholly contained within Clark County—Districts 1 and 4. The other two districts make up the rest of the state. District 2, the most northern district, has all of Carson City as well as all of Douglas, Elko, Eureka, Humboldt, Lander, Lincoln, Lyon, Pershing, Storey, White Pine, and Washoe Counties and part of Nye County. District 3 contains all of Churchill, Esmeralda, and Mineral Counties as well as parts of Nye and Clark Counties.

Michael Stewart:

The ideal population to achieve for congressional districts is 675,138. As you can see from the population report ([Exhibit F](#)), the largest positive deviation is zero percent, and the largest negative population deviation is zero percent. That is a difference of one person. I actually think that is a function of trying to round odd numbers, so there is an overall range of deviation of 1, but statistically it is zero percent.

Turning to the ethnic and racial data report regarding the Hispanic or Latino population, Congressional District 1 is at 33.56 percent and Congressional District 3 is at 29.20 percent. That is in comparison to the total state population identified as Hispanic or Latino at 26.53 percent. In terms of black or African American, Congressional District 1 has the highest percentage at 14.31 percent. I would also point out a notable Asian population in Congressional District 4 at 15.46 percent. That concludes the Democratic congressional plan.

Chair Segerblom:

You will receive the summary of BDR 17-1287, which will be the Democratic Assembly BDR for the three plans. I know staff is working to develop the Republican BDR, but we do have the information, so would you please present that plan.

Kathy Steinle:

Now we will look at the Republican plan for the Assembly districts. Thirty districts are wholly contained within Clark County and five districts are wholly contained within Washoe County. On the statewide map ([Exhibit L](#)), you can see the rural districts. District 32 has parts of Churchill, Humboldt, Lander, and Washoe Counties and all of Pershing County. District 33 has all of Elko, Eureka, and White Pine Counties as well as parts of Lincoln and Nye Counties. District 36 has parts of Clark, Lincoln, and Nye Counties. District 38 has part of Carson City as well as parts of Churchill, Lyon, and Washoe Counties.

District 39 has part of Carson City plus parts of Churchill, Douglas, Lander, Lyon, Nye, and Washoe Counties along with all of Esmeralda and Mineral Counties. District 40 has the remainder of Carson City, along with parts of Douglas, Lyon, Storey, and Washoe Counties.

Chair Segerblom:

Are these districts consistent with current districts in similar areas?

Kathy Steinle:

I believe they are. I have not done a direct comparison of the numbers yet.

Chair Segerblom:

I think Mr. Goicoechea indicated that they are.

Kathy Steinle:

Looking at the Washoe County area—Reno and Sparks ([Exhibit M](#))—you can see that Districts 24, 25, 27, 30, and 31 are wholly contained within Washoe County. Moving into the Las Vegas area ([Exhibit N](#)), 30 districts are totally contained within Clark County. Those districts are numbers 1 through 23 in addition to Districts 28, 29, 34, 35, 37, 41, and 42.

Michael Stewart:

Turning to the statistical report on this plan and identifying the total Hispanic or Latino population, many districts are in the 50 percent to 60 percent range. District 3 is 58.3 percent, District 7 is 56.8 percent, District 11 is 58.1 percent, District 12 is 59.2 percent, District 14 is 55.8 percent, District 15 is 56.4 percent, District 28 is 55.8 percent, and District 31 is 50.5 percent.

In terms of the black or African American voting-age population, notable districts are District 6 at 37.8 percent, District 28 at 18.7 percent, District 19 at 14.8 percent, and District 37 at 12.9 percent.

Looking at the total population in terms of overall deviation, there is a high positive deviation of 0.5 percent. That number occurs in Districts 17, 34, and 37. The largest negative deviation of -0.4 percent occurs in Districts 10, 18, 26, 27, 32, 38, and 40. That represents an overall range of deviation of 0.9 percent.

Kathy Steinle:

Now we are going to look at the Republican plan for the Senate districts ([Exhibit O](#)). This is the same plan that was presented at the Committee of the Whole last week, except the numbering on the districts has changed.

Fifteen districts are wholly contained within Clark County, and two are wholly contained within Washoe County. District 18 includes parts of Churchill, Lyon, Mineral, Nye, Storey, and Washoe Counties as well as all of Esmeralda County. District 19 includes parts of Churchill and Clark Counties as well as all of Elko, Eureka, Lander, Lincoln, Humboldt, Pershing, and White Pine Counties.

Looking at the Washoe County area ([Exhibit P](#)), Districts 13 and 14 are wholly contained within Washoe County, as are parts of Districts 16 and 18. In Clark County ([Exhibit Q](#)), Districts 1 through 12 and Districts 15, 20, and 21 are wholly contained within that county.

Michael Stewart:

Turning to the population and ethnicity report for the Republican Senate district plan, notable districts for total Hispanic population are District 3 at 57.9 percent, District 2 at 57.3 percent, and District 20 at 56.8 percent. The district with the most black or African American voting-age population is District 4 at 25.3 percent. In terms of the total population, the ideal population for a Senate district is 128,598, and the largest positive deviation is 0.09 percent in District 20. The largest negative deviation is -0.07 percent in District 17 for an overall range of deviation of 0.16 percent.

Kathy Steinle:

We will now look at the Republican congressional plan ([Exhibit R](#)). This is the same plan you saw during the Committees of the Whole last week. Districts 2 and 3 are the northernmost districts; Districts 1 and 4 are wholly contained within Clark County. Looking at the splits in the western part of the state, Lyon and Douglas Counties get split between Districts 2 and 3 ([Exhibit S](#)). Looking at the Las Vegas area ([Exhibit T](#)), you can see that Districts 1 and 4 are wholly contained within Clark County.

Michael Stewart:

Looking at the population and ethnicity report, like the Democratic plan, this plan has a positive deviation of zero and a negative deviation of zero with a difference of one person. The notable district for Hispanic population is Congressional District 4 with 50.7 percent. The black or African American voting-age population in District 4 is 14.2 percent.

Kathy Steinle:

I want to point out that on the home page of the Nevada Legislature's website, under the seal on the left, is a "Nevada Reapportionment & Redistricting" button. Click on that button to get to the next page, where the second tab across reads "Proposed Plans." If you click on that, you will see all the plans presented today—those are the ones that say "revised"—and all the ones that were presented last week at the Committees of the Whole. Plans include Assembly and Senate districts as well as the two congressional plans. You will see all the maps you saw today and all the tables as well.

Chair Segerblom:

I know the Democratic plans are available at the workstations.

Kathy Steinle:

That is correct.

Chair Segerblom:

Again, for the public record, where can the public find the workstations?

Kathy Steinle:

The Democratic plans will be available on both public workstations. There is one in this building in Carson City on the second floor, and there is one in our offices in Las Vegas. Phone numbers and information on how to contact staff to access the workstations are on our website at the bottom of the home page.

Chair Segerblom:

Thank you very much. Are there any questions for staff? [There was no response.]

This is a public hearing, so at this point we will take testimony on any of the plans that have been presented. We will begin in Las Vegas.

Ed Gobel, representing GoWest Institute:

This is a lot to digest all at once. I have a question about the plans that were presented at an earlier hearing, including ours, which have been listed under the exhibits. Our plan was titled "All For Our State." Are those also available in the same area under the redistricting and reapportionment tabs?

Kathy Steinle:

Yes. I neglected to point that out, and I apologize. On our reapportionment page, under "Proposed Plans," we have "Legislative Proposals" and "Public Proposals." If you click on the "Public Proposals" page, you can see the plans and documents that were presented. I believe all the plans were presented during the April 2 meeting we had in Las Vegas.

Chair Segerblom:

Mr. Gobel, I do not know if you can see it, but I am looking at the web page, and your name is prominently displayed along with that of Linda West Myers.

Ed Gobel:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I cannot tell you how much we appreciate this opportunity and all the information that has been available this time—more than at any time in history. I thank you, Senator Parks, and both Committees for your work.

We only want to speak to the congressional maps. We slightly disagree with the type of redistricting that was done in both the Democrat and Republican plans. Both are done along the lines of north-south districts. Our plan was different, in that each congressional district contained a sliver of Clark County along with a good portion of the rest of the state, so our four congressional districts could be unified in purpose and represent the entire state. We think that is much more important. We also disagree about creating majority/minority districts, because we think that is just as unfair as diluting populations to make one minority larger in one district than in another, which then dilutes that minority's standing in the other districts.

I want to thank you for the opportunity to speak and remind you that all my other information is available on your website.

Chair Segerblom:

Are there any questions for Mr. Gobel? I see Ms. Myers is signed in to speak as well as Ms. Blanco.

Linda West Myers, representing GoWest Institute:

I echo Mr. Gobel's comments. I think it is important to unite the north and the south.

Chair Segerblom:

Are there any questions for Ms. West Myers? [There were none.]

Artie Blanco, Nevada State Director, Mi Familia Vota:

[Ms. Blanco read her testimony in support of the Democratic plan from prepared text ([Exhibit U](#)).] In looking at the districts, we see that some changes will be made. We are looking forward to seeing reviewed maps as they are released in the coming weeks.

Chair Segerblom:

Are there any questions for Ms. Blanco? [There were none.]

Tibi Ellis, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

[Ms. Ellis read her testimony, about fracturing groups of minority voters, from prepared text ([Exhibit V](#)).]

Chair Segerblom:

Are there any questions? [There were none.]

Forrest Darby, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

Looking at the Republican and Democratic proposals for the congressional districts, I am wondering how long it will be before this goes to court. I cannot imagine that there can be an agreement between the Republicans and the Democrats on this because they are so different. If you cannot agree, what is the timetable on going to court?

Chair Segerblom:

Actually, all you can do is give testimony. If you want to present any, you are welcome to do so.

Forrest Darby:

No, that is fine. That is all I had to say. Thank you.

Roxanne McCoy, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I want to ensure as we move forward with redistricting that minority interests are protected in the process, and that we keep the proposal the Democrats presented. That is a map that makes sense for the minority community and respects those communities of interest.

Chair Segerblom:

Are there any questions? [There were none.]

Fernando Romero, State Director, Democracy USA; President, Hispanics in Politics:

Thank you for the opportunity to testify before you and address our concerns and interest vis-à-vis our Hispanic community and redistricting. The 2010 Census data revealed that most of Nevada's ten largest counties have significant Latino populations. We ask that you, as a body, respect that as decisions regarding boundaries are made. We ask that you be responsive to the many areas that form communities of interest, particularly in and around northeast and east Las Vegas, and which should not be split during redistricting. The primary boundaries are Interstate 15, Nellis Boulevard, Cheyenne Avenue, and Desert Inn Road. We further request that you be responsive to our Latino communities as they are now. Our Latino community grew in a dispersed manner, but we want the opportunity to be able to participate in all areas of government and to have the freedom to elect our strongest candidates. In other words, we ask that the Voting Rights Act be upheld to allow for traditionally underrepresented communities to elect candidates of their choice.

On behalf of Democracy USA and Hispanics in Politics, I want to thank both parties for submitting your recommended maps. Although I do not want to sound partisan, I respectfully disagree with all three of the Republican maps. That is not a roundabout approval of the Democratic maps, for we, in coalition with other Hispanic community groups and leaders, want the opportunity to submit our own ideas and suggestions for your consideration. I just had the opportunity to review the congressional map submitted by the Democrats, and I would like to see minor adjustments to the boundaries.

Chair Segerblom:

Are there any questions for Mr. Romero? [There were none.]

Hui-Lim Ang, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am a little disappointed that the Asian population here was not taken into consideration in the Republican plan, so I will address only the Democratic plan. Historically, the Asian community has not been the most politically active community; however, there are some of us who are making extra efforts to get qualified Asians to run for offices. I am appealing to you not to split our Asian population in each of the areas here. If you do that, you will find it will be very hard for us to garner support among our Asian people. As it is, it is already very difficult to get them to be politically interested. By splitting our population up, you are going to split our votes and diminish our chance to ever have a qualified Asian representative in any elected office. I hope you will take us into consideration in any future planning. Thank you.

Chair Segerblom:

Are there any questions? [There were none.] Is there anyone else in the south who wishes to testify? [There was no response.] Is there anyone in Elko?

Jim Cooney, Private Citizen, Elko, Nevada:

I am just monitoring the process.

Chair Segerblom:

Is there anyone up north who wants to testify?

Dan Musgrove, representing the City of North Las Vegas:

I want to thank you for what has been done so far in terms of the maps we have seen, the jurisdictional boundaries of municipalities, and how they overlap and are included into these Assembly and Senate districts. It is very important for local jurisdictions to have representatives they can reach out to who will represent their interests. Since the last census, North Las Vegas has been challenged a bit because only two of our representatives had districts wholly inside our municipal boundaries. Other jurisdictions—for instance, the Cities of Henderson and Las Vegas—have legislators representing close to 100 percent of their cities. North Las Vegas has a number of representatives, but they are split and represent multiple cities or multiple jurisdictions. We appreciate the fact that you are keeping that in mind as you look at these maps and boundaries. We believe it is important to have voices we can come to in the Legislature to discuss the issues that are unique to our own cities and municipalities. I just wanted to put that on the record and to thank you for your consideration as represented by the current maps.

Chair Segerblom:

Thank you, Mr. Musgrove. Are there any questions for Mr. Musgrove? [There was no response.] Is there anyone else who wishes to testify? [There was no response.] We are having another hearing tomorrow afternoon, so anyone who can hear this but was not able to testify will be able to testify tomorrow afternoon at 4:30.

I am now requesting introduction of BDR 17-1287, the Democratic plan.

BDR 17-1287—Revises the legislative districts from which members of the Senate and Assembly are elected and revises the districts from which Representatives of Congress are elected. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 566](#).)

ASSEMBLYMAN OCEGUERA MOVED FOR COMMITTEE
INTRODUCTION OF BDR 17-1287.

ASSEMBLYMAN CONKLIN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN OHRENSCHALL WAS
ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

We are adjourned [at 2:49 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Terry Horgan
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Tick Segerblom, Chair

DATE: _____

Senator David R. Parks, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Assembly Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections/Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections

Date: May 5, 2011

Time of Meeting: 1:58 p.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
	C	Kathy Steinle	Statewide Map— Democratic Assembly Plan
	D	Kathy Steinle	Reno/Sparks Area Plan
	E	Kathy Steinle	Clark County Plan
	F	Michael Stewart	Statistical Information for All Redistricting Plans
	G	Kathy Steinle	Statewide Map— Democratic Senate Plan
	H	Kathy Steinle	Washoe County Senate Districts Plan
	I	Kathy Steinle	Clark County Senate Districts Plan
	J	Kathy Steinle	Democratic Congressional Districts Plan
	K	Kathy Steinle	Las Vegas View of the Democratic Congressional Plan
	L	Kathy Steinle	Statewide Map— Republican Assembly Plan
	M	Kathy Steinle	Washoe County, Reno/Sparks Area Plan
	N	Kathy Steinle	Las Vegas Area Plan
	O	Kathy Steinle	Statewide Republican Senate Districts Plan
	P	Kathy Steinle	Washoe County Senate Districts Plan
	Q	Kathy Steinle	Clark County Senate Districts Plan

	R	Kathy Steinle	Republican Congressional Plan
	S	Kathy Steinle	Rural Districts Congressional Plan
	T	Kathy Steinle	Las Vegas Area Congressional Districts Plan
	U	Artie Blanco	Prepared Text
	V	Tibi Ellis	Prepared Text