

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

**Seventy-Sixth Session
May 17, 2011**

The Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections was called to order by Chair Tick Segerblom at 1:53 p.m. on Tuesday, May 17, 2011, in Room 3142 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4406 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, 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).

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 Crescent Hardy
Assemblyman Pat Hickey
Assemblywoman Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick
Assemblyman Richard McArthur
Assemblyman John Ocegüera
Assemblyman James Ohrenschall
Assemblywoman Debbie Smith
Assemblyman Lynn D. Stewart

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblyman William C. Horne (excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Michael J. Stewart, Supervising Principal Research Analyst
Kathy Steinle, GIS Manager, Information Technology Services
Patrick Guinan, Committee Policy Analyst
Terry Horgan, Committee Secretary
Michael Smith, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Matt Griffin, Former Deputy for Elections, Office of the Secretary of State

Chair Segerblom:

[Roll was taken.] Today we are having a work session on several bills. Let us begin with Senate Bill 125. Mr. Guinan, will you please explain that bill?

Senate Bill 125: Revises provisions governing reporting of campaign contributions and expenses. (BDR 24-777)

Patrick Guinan, Committee Policy Analyst:

We have work session books for Committee members today. The information they contain is also available on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS) for anyone else who wants to take a look at them. [Mr. Guinan read an explanation of the bill from his work session document ([Exhibit C](#)).]

Chair Segerblom:

Does anyone object to passing S.B. 125 with amendments that would conform it to Assembly Bill 452 which this Committee already passed? Senator Kieckhefer wanted to add one filing of a contribution and expense (C&E) report before the start of early voting, which A.B. 452 also does. We want to conform the two bills in case they both pass. Everyone would file C&E reports with the Secretary of State, but this adds a reporting period before early voting starts.

I think everyone agreed that we wanted an additional filing period. I am asking for a motion. Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick, did you make a motion?

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick:

I understand what you are doing. You are trying to make the bills parallel so if the other bill, with its additional provisions, does not make it out, at least this language requiring an additional filing would become law. Is that correct?

Chair Segerblom:
Exactly.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN KIRKPATRICK MOVED TO AMEND AND DO
PASS SENATE BILL 125.

ASSEMBLYMAN OHRENSCHALL SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN CONKLIN, HORNE, AND
SMITH WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

All right, we will move on to Senate Bill 134.

Senate Bill 134: Amends the Charter of the City of Elko to change the timing of
the general municipal election. (BDR S-543)

Patrick Guinan, Committee Policy Analyst:
[Mr. Guinan read an explanation of the bill from his work session document
([Exhibit D](#)).]

Assemblyman McArthur:
I do not remember hearing this bill.

Chair Segerblom:
We heard this bill quite a while ago. It allows the City of Elko to change its
municipal elections to even years. Also, the city council members agreed that
their terms would be reduced.

Patrick Guinan:
We heard this bill on March 15, and Senator Rhoads presented it. It is the same
bill we heard last session, but at that time additional language got amended into
the bill, and it did not pass. It was essentially approved last session, and we
heard it very early on this session because it came out of the Senate very
quickly.

Assemblyman McArthur:
This is not the same as an Assembly bill we heard, is it?

Chair Segerblom:
The Assembly bill is still active in the Senate. That bill would allow Elko to
make this change, but it also allows some cities in Clark County to do the same
thing. This bill applies only to the City of Elko.

ASSEMBLYMAN GOICOECHEA MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 134.

ASSEMBLYMAN GRADY SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was no response.]

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

Let us move to Senate Bill 157.

Senate Bill 157: Revises provisions governing the donation of unspent
campaign contributions. (BDR 24-6)

Patrick Guinan, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Mr. Guinan read an explanation of the bill from his work session document
([Exhibit E](#)).]

Chair Segerblom:

Is there any discussion? [There was no response.]

ASSEMBLYMAN STEWART MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 157.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN FLORES SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

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

Now we will move on to Assembly Bill 566 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 566 (1st Reprint): 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. (BDR 17-1287)

Chair Segerblom:

We have a presentation by staff on a proposed amendment to the bill.

Michael J. Stewart, Supervising Principal Research Analyst:

As we have in previous meetings, we have been asked today to provide factual information regarding certain reapportionment and redistricting plans that have been compiled for consideration by the Assembly Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections.

Before we begin, we have to make our standard Legislative Counsel Bureau disclosure: 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 merely present basic factual information about redistricting plans for congressional districts, Assembly districts, and Senate districts as set forth in A.B. 566 (R1). With each plan, Kathy Steinle will start with an explanation of the key geographic components and features of the overall plan, including some district-specific information. I will follow up with a brief summary of statistical information—population, population deviation from the ideal population, and information regarding race, ethnicity, and ethnic-minority concentrations in some legislative districts. Kathy Steinle will begin with a description of the Assembly plan that is set forth in A.B. 566 (R1).

Chair Segerblom:

This is a proposed amendment to A.B. 566 (R1), which we passed last week. Is that correct? [Mr. Stewart and Ms. Steinle nodded yes.]

This bill is on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS), and it is also publicly available on the workstations. In those public workstation computers, you can find any data we have and manipulate the numbers and look thoroughly at every district. Is that correct? [Mr. Stewart and Ms. Steinle nodded yes.]

Also, everyone has maps at their desks, so please proceed.

Kathy Steinle, GIS Manager, Information Technology Services:

I have three overview maps—one of the state, one of the Washoe County/Reno/Sparks area, and one of the Clark County/Las Vegas area. We are going to start with the Assembly plan. You have copies of all these maps along with the tables ([Exhibit F](#)). The first map shows the state view of the Assembly plan ([Exhibit G](#)). You can see that 30 districts are wholly contained within Clark County, 6 are wholly contained within Washoe County, and the remaining districts contain parts of the rural areas and Washoe and Clark Counties.

Looking at the Reno/Sparks area ([Exhibit H](#)), you can see the six districts that are wholly contained within Washoe County. Those are Districts 24, 25, 27, 30, 31, and 32. The one district that spreads north into Washoe County is District 32.

Looking at the Las Vegas/Clark County area ([Exhibit I](#)), the 30 districts wholly contained within Clark County include Districts 1 through 23, Districts 28, 29, 34, 37, 39, 41, and 42. District 36 dips down into Clark County.

Michael Stewart:

Looking at the statistical information for this plan ([Exhibit F](#)), as we have stated before, when conducting reapportionment and redistricting, we try to achieve as close to equal population as possible. All the plans presented throughout the session have fallen within the recognized acceptable overall range of population deviation, and this plan is no different in that regard. The largest positive population deviation is 211 persons, which is 0.33 percent, in District 33. The largest negative deviation is -101 persons, which is -0.16 percent, in District 35, so the overall range of deviation here is 312 persons, which is 0.49 percent.

Looking at some of the notable ethnic considerations, in terms of Hispanic or Latino population, the district with the largest percentage of Hispanic or Latino residents is District 28 with 72.95 percent, followed by District 11 at 71.22 percent, and District 19 at 53.44 percent. I would note that there are also four districts with over 40 percent Hispanic or Latino population, and those are District 14 at 48.34 percent, District 6 at 43.52 percent, District 15 at 41.11 percent, and District 9 at 40.84 percent.

Turning to the black or African American population, the district with the largest percentage in that category is District 7 with 29.79 percent, followed by District 6 at 26.63 percent and District 17 at 22.50 percent.

Two districts have an Asian population of over 20 percent. One is District 8 at 20.75 percent and the other is the proposed open district, District 39, with 26.63 percent.

Kathy Steinle:

Now we will switch to the 21-district Senate plan. Looking at the statewide view ([Exhibit J](#)), only three districts are not in either Clark or Washoe Counties—Districts 17, 18, and 19. District 17 contains all of Carson City and parts of Douglas, Lyon, Storey, and Washoe Counties. District 18 contains all of Churchill, Esmeralda, Humboldt, Lander, Mineral, and Pershing Counties as well as parts of Douglas, Lyon, Nye, and Storey Counties.

District 19 contains parts of Clark and Nye Counties and all of Elko, Eureka, White Pine, and Lincoln Counties.

Three Senate districts are wholly contained within Washoe County and those are Senate Districts 13, 14, and 16 ([Exhibit K](#)). District 17 comes up from the south into Washoe County and contains part of it. Fifteen Senate districts are wholly contained within Clark County ([Exhibit L](#)) and they are Districts 1 through 12, 15, 20, and 21. One district dips down into Clark County, and that is District 19.

Michael Stewart:

Turning to the population report for the proposed Senate plan ([Exhibit M](#)), the largest positive deviation is 132 persons, which is 0.10 percent, in District 4, with a negative deviation of -167 persons, which is -0.13 percent, in District 20. The overall range of deviation is 299 persons or 0.23 percent.

Turning to the racial and ethnic information, the highest concentration of Hispanic or Latino population is in proposed Senate District 2 at 63.68 percent, followed by Senate District 10 at 58.61 percent. The populations in three districts contain between 30 and 40 percent Hispanic, and those are District 4 at 39.62 percent, District 3 at 33.66 percent, and District 14 in Washoe County at 33.08 percent.

Looking at the black and African American population, District 4 has the highest percentage at 26.91 percent, and District 1 has the second-largest concentration at 20.89 percent. District 9 has the largest Asian concentration at 21.90 percent.

Kathy Steinle:

Looking at the statewide map of the congressional plan for districts ([Exhibit N](#)), Districts 2 and 4 are the northern districts, and Districts 1 and 3 are wholly contained within Clark County. District 2 contains all of Carson City and all of Churchill, Douglas, Elko, Eureka, Humboldt, Lander, Pershing, Storey, and Washoe Counties and part of Lyon County. District 4 has parts of Clark and Lyon Counties and all of Esmeralda, Lincoln, Mineral, Nye, and White Pine Counties. Districts 1 and 3 are wholly contained within the Las Vegas area. District 4 completely surrounds those two districts in Clark County.

Michael Stewart:

Our overall range of deviation is 1 person, which I believe to be a function of dividing an odd number by the total population, so the largest positive deviation is zero and the largest negative deviation is -1 ([Exhibit O](#)). In

terms of the ethnic and racial data, proposed Congressional District 3 has the highest concentration of Hispanic or Latino population at 36.72 percent, followed by Congressional District 1 at 26.28 percent. The largest concentration of the black or African American population is in Congressional District 1 at 14.37 percent. Congressional Districts 1 and 3 have similar numbers of Asian population, Congressional District 1 at 10.62 percent and Congressional District 3 at 10.78 percent. We would like to remind everyone that all this information is available on the Legislature's website.

Kathy Steinle:

From the Nevada Legislature homepage, you can click on the Nevada Reapportionment and Redistricting button under the seal. From the Reapportionment and Redistricting homepage, click on Proposed Plans, and both legislative proposals and public proposals are available. On the Legislative Proposals page, all the plans from both parties are presented along with their tables. On the Public Proposals page, all the plans presented by members of the public, and their accompanying tables are also available.

Chair Segerblom:

There is a workstation here in this building and also in the Grant Sawyer State Office Building in Las Vegas. They have all these plans. You can also see voting histories and information like that.

Kathy Steinle:

Yes, that is right, Mr. Chairman. At the bottom of the Reapportionment and Redistricting site's homepage is all the contact information for the Carson City and Las Vegas offices. We can sit down at the workstations with you and show you the plans.

Chair Segerblom:

Those are the Democratic plans.

Kathy Steinle:

Yes, sir.

Assemblyman Hardy:

What areas are being amended so that we are hearing this bill again?

Kathy Steinle:

Twenty-eight districts were changed in the Assembly plan. Rather than going through all those changes, we were just asked to do an overview. I cannot really detail which specific changes were made.

Assemblyman Hickey:

Can you show me, or do you know of any instance, where any of the public plans were incorporated into this amendment?

Kathy Steinle:

As nonpartisan staff, the plans are given to us and we produce the maps and tables. As far as creation of the district boundaries, we were not included in the reasoning behind some of those decisions.

Chair Segerblom:

Are there any further questions?

Assemblyman Ocegueda:

These maps are available, right down to the block level, at the public workstations, and you can look at them. Both Democratic proposals—the one from last week and the one from today—have been posted on the public workstations. To this day, the Republican maps and block assignment files are not on the public workstations, so it would be difficult to compare plans at this point. Without this data, no member of the public or any interested party, including the members on this Committee, can verify that the data works. We are at a disadvantage here ourselves. I can tell you that all the information proposed in these maps, and in the maps before, is available for you to look at publicly.

Assemblyman Hickey:

Our maps, as I recall, were never heard or considered in this Committee, so I can only direct my questions to the amendment, in this case, or the bills that have come before us. I ask the question again: Is there any example within this plan, which the makers of the plan can point to, that incorporated any of the public input we received or that the public did at the workstations? Is there any evidence or place we can note where there has been that input?

Assemblyman Ocegueda:

There were minor changes in all districts. As you know, if you start in the middle and move out, every time one change is made, it affects another district. If you make a change to that second district, it affects a third. As Ms. Steinle said, 28 districts were affected. Based on floor statements and discussion about deviation, we made some changes.

Chair Segerblom:

Thank you very much, staff, for an excellent presentation. Would you, Patrick, explain the amendment?

Patrick Guinan, Committee Policy Analyst:

The members have a summary of the proposed amendment at their desks ([Exhibit P](#)). In the initial bill, sections 1 through 52 were the redistricting plan, so in the proposed amendment, sections 1 through 52 have been stricken entirely. The new plan starts with an introductory section at section 53. The rest of the bill goes from section 54 forward. The motion from the Committee would be to amend and do pass as proposed in the document you have before you, which starts with section 53.

Chair Segerblom:

One concern has always been to present all the information early enough so that everyone would have a chance to look at it, the Governor would have a chance to look at it, and we do not try to mix all this stuff up at the end of the session. One reason we are trying to move this is because we want as much time as possible so everyone can consider it.

Is there a motion to amend and do pass?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN FLORES MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 566 (1st REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN OHRENSCHALL SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN GOICOECHEA, GRADY,
HARDY, HICKEY, MCARTHUR, AND STEWART VOTED NO.
ASSEMBLYMAN HORNE WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Assemblyman Ocegüera:

I am perplexed about why we cannot get this information. I would like to have this discussion. We can keep putting maps forward and voting them out along partisan lines. If we had the block assignments and the data on these bills, we could have that discussion. I know a motion does not have much value here, but I would like to make a motion that any data on redistricting, either requested by the Committee or presented to the Legislative Counsel Bureau, be made available upon request. If we could do that, maybe we could have a meaningful discussion going forward.

Assemblyman Conklin:

I would second that.

Chair Segerblom:

The motion is that we believe each side should put all their material onto the public workstation so we can analyze the maps in detail to understand what

they actually represent. At this point, the Democrats have put forth two bills that contain all the details for everyone to see. They are on the public workstations so you can go in and massage them any way you want to. The Republican bill we were given does not provide those details, so it is hard to have a work session and compare the two bills when one bill is deficient by its nature.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

Mr. Chair, I know we have been talking about the need for a hearing on our bill, Assembly Bill 567. Let me work on that. I will see if I can get the data and get it submitted in exchange for a hearing.

Assemblyman Ocegüera:

These bills have been presented in Committee twice and in the Committee of the Whole. I would entertain having further discussions with the data available.

Assemblyman Hickey:

I take exception with one thing the Speaker said, and that is additional conversations. I do not think we have really had any conversations until this point.

[The Chair called for an informal vote on the motion, and the motion passed on party lines.]

Chair Segerblom:

Let us move on to Senate Bill 133 (1st Reprint).

[Senate Bill 133 \(1st Reprint\)](#): Revises provisions governing initiative petitions.
(BDR 24-1)

Patrick Guinan, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Mr. Guinan read an explanation of the bill from his work session document ([Exhibit Q](#)).] We do have an amendment ([Exhibit R](#)) requested by the Chairman just before the hearing. I believe, Mr. Chairman, you have Matt Griffin here to describe the amendment.

Chair Segerblom:

Yes, I have been working with the stakeholders in this process. After much discussion, they came up with what we consider to be relatively minor changes that all interested parties, including Senator Rhoads, have supported. Mr. Griffin will explain the proposed amendment for everyone.

Matt Griffin, Former Deputy for Elections, Office of the Secretary of State:

The amendment does three things involving the circulation of initiative and referenda petitions. First, anyone who is a paid petition circulator would be considered an employee under *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 608. All the rights and responsibilities under that statute would apply to circulators who are paid. Second, if circulators are going to be paid, the Secretary of State's Office must be notified of that fact in the registration papers when the petition is filed. A disclaimer stating that people are being paid to gather signatures must also appear on the petition being circulated. Third, it requires that anyone who is going to circulate a petition in the State of Nevada must be a resident of the State of Nevada. In 1999, Colorado had a statute requiring that people be registered voters of that state in order to circulate petitions in that state. Many other states had that requirement as well. That requirement has been thrown out, and the response by all the Western states, as well as by Maine and Mississippi, is to require an individual be a resident of the state to circulate a petition within the state.

These amendments are designed to accomplish a couple of things for the working group the Chair spoke of: protection for the people who are circulating petitions, and with that protection comes additional accountability. If fraudulent activity is alleged to be occurring during the circulation of an initiative petition, establishing that employer-employee relationship means you can track down the person who might be responsible for fraudulent activities.

As noted, it is a benefit for the person who is going to be circulating the petition. If I am going to receive a minimum wage to circulate a petition and gather signatures, it reduces the incentive for a ballot advocacy group or political action committee to pay its circulators on a per-signature basis. If I gather no signatures, I still get paid for that day's work. The model we currently have is that people are paid for the number of signatures they get on a petition. Under that model, we have heard about signature-gathering parties where someone grabs a phone book, writes names from that phone book onto the petition, and gets paid for every name copied from that phone book.

Chair Segerblom:

For further clarification, the minimum-wage piece of this amendment was designed because, right now, you can pay someone per signature gathered. Oftentimes, the circulator does not gather enough signatures to equal a minimum wage. We thought if people were being employed to do this, they should at least earn minimum wage. I think that part is very important.

Assemblyman Hardy:

Does this open up problems with workers' compensation and liability insurance if the circulators are working as employees?

Matt Griffin:

I do not believe so, but I am not an expert. These are typically short-term employees. Petitions for statutory amendments typically are circulated for only three or four months, so it does not create any extended type of employment relationship. Petitions can go onto the ballot only in even-numbered years, so it would not even be a yearly effort; it would be more of a biennial effort.

Assemblyman Hardy:

I appreciate the comment, but I think we need to find that out for sure. Will there be a need for liability or unemployment insurance?

Chair Segerblom:

If you employ someone, and this bill would make him an employee, the employer would be liable for workers' compensation and things like that. That is part of the benefit; we would actually be hiring people—putting them on the payroll and getting them out of the unemployment lines. Mr. Hardy, do you want us to hold this bill until we get a definite answer to your questions? [Mr. Hardy nodded yes.] We have one more work session on Thursday, so maybe Mr. Griffin could get some answers and plan to come back.

Assemblyman McArthur:

Are these petition districts determined by population?

Matt Griffin:

Yes, they are. They are based on the U.S. Census and the congressional districts. After this redistricting, they will be equal in population going forward.

Chair Segerblom:

Mr. Griffin, if you could take that assignment and plan to come back at 1:30 p.m. on Thursday, that would be great.

Assemblyman Conklin:

Mr. Hardy, I am trying to understand your concern. I assume you are talking about subsection 3, which refers to NRS 294A.284, on the amendment's second page.

Assemblyman Hardy:

Discussing the salaries, having to pay someone as an employee, and protection for the employees; if they are hired as employees, what effect does that have ultimately?

Assemblyman Conklin:

Transparency is a critical component of the petition process. As a signer of a ballot initiative and a supporter—whether financial or as a voter—you have a right to understand whether the ballot is being procured by someone who wants to put a lot of money into a program, or if it is a grassroots-based idea that has come forth from the people on a volunteer basis and is a very important matter to our state. Over the years, we have seen both types of ballots. This is another way to express to the public that this is something being brought from out of state and imposed upon our voters versus something that has started in state and has groundswelled from the bottom to the top. Along with that, reading at the bottom of the next section at NRS 295.055, if you accept that some people are being paid to gather signatures while others are doing it because they believe it is the right thing to do, if someone is going to get paid to gather signatures, that individual ought to be subject to the same state laws all the rest of you are. Many of us employ people and are subject to those laws. It is more a matter of transparency. If we are going to be transparent, people are going to have to comply with the law.

Assemblyman Hickey:

We all appreciate the problem this amendment is trying to address. There is nothing in this that would prevent an employer from adding additional incentives. Besides the minimum wage, an employer could also be giving a certain amount for each signature brought in. You might still have the same problem. This goes after it but does not necessarily prevent it from ever happening in another way, does it?

Matt Griffin:

That is correct, and that can occur right now. It is incentive-driven—bring in 100 signatures and I will give you so much for each signature. In addition to the issues the Committee has been discussing, NRS Chapter 608 requires employment records. Those employment records have to be made available to the authorities in the state. Under NRS Chapter 608, as an employer, I have to keep that information and divulge it if need be. If there is some type of unlawful incentive given, there is an actual record outlined for that, and currently there is not.

Chair Segerblom:

We will bring this matter back up on Thursday. Patrick, what else do we have?

Patrick Guinan:

The last bill on the list today is Senate Bill 390 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 390 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the statewide voter registration list. (BDR 24-1117)

Patrick Guinan, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Mr. Guinan read an explanation of the bill from his work session document ([Exhibit S](#)).]

Chair Segerblom:

Are there any questions or comments about S.B. 390 (R1)? [There was no response.] Is there a motion?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN FLORES MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 390 (1st REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN HICKEY SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion? [There was no response.]

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

Is there any public comment? [There was no response.] The hearing is adjourned [at 2:43 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Terry Horgan
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Tick Segerblom, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections

Date: May 17, 2011

Time of Meeting: 1:53 p.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
S.B. 125	C	Patrick Guinan	Work Session Document
S.B. 134	D	Patrick Guinan	Work Session Document
S.B. 157	E	Patrick Guinan	Work Session Document
A.B. 566 (R1)	F	Kathy Steinle	Population and Demographics for Assembly Plan
A.B. 566 (R1)	G	Kathy Steinle	Map of Statewide Assembly Districts
A.B. 566 (R1)	H	Kathy Steinle	Map of Reno/Sparks Area Assembly Districts
A.B. 566 (R1)	I	Kathy Steinle	Map of Las Vegas/Clark County Area Assembly Districts
A.B. 566 (R1)	J	Kathy Steinle	Map of Statewide Senate Districts
A.B. 566 (R1)	K	Kathy Steinle	Map of Washoe County Senate Districts
A.B. 566 (R1)	L	Kathy Steinle	Map of Clark County Senate Districts
A.B. 566 (R1)	M	Michael Stewart	Population and Demographics Report for Senate Plan
A.B. 566 (R1)	N	Kathy Steinle	Statewide Map of Congressional Districts Plan
A.B. 566 (R1)	O	Michael Stewart	Population and Demographics for Congressional Districts Plan

Assembly Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections

May 17, 2011

Page 17

A.B. 566 (R1)	P	Patrick Guinan	Summary of Proposed Amendment
S.B. 133 (R1)	Q	Patrick Guinan	Work Session Document
S.B. 133 (R1)	R	Patrick Guinan	Proposed Amendment
S.B. 390 (R1)	S	Patrick Guinan	Work Session Document