

**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 24, 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 3:40 p.m. on Tuesday, May 24, 2011, in Room 4100 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412 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).

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 Crescent Hardy
Assemblyman Pat Hickey
Assemblyman William C. Horne
Assemblywoman Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick
Assemblyman Richard McArthur
Assemblyman John Ocegüera
Assemblyman James Ohrenschall
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:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Michael J. Stewart, Supervising Principal Research Analyst
Kathy Steinle, GIS Manager, Information Technology Services
Patrick Guinan, Assembly Committee Policy Analyst
Eileen O'Grady, Committee Counsel
Sonia Folsom, Senate Committee Manager
Terry Horgan, Assembly Committee Secretary
Michael Smith, Assembly Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Scott G. Wasserman, Chief Executive Officer and Special Counsel to the
Board of Regents
Keith Rheault, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of
Education

Chair Segerblom:

[Roll was taken.] We will start today's hearing with Assembly Bill 570, which is the redistricting plan for the Board of Regents.

Assembly Bill 570: Revises the districts from which the members of the Board of Regents of the University of Nevada are elected. (BDR 34-1293)

Scott G. Wasserman, Chief Executive Officer and Special Counsel to the Board of Regents:

[Mr. Wasserman presented a PowerPoint of the plan ([Exhibit C](#)).] This plan is the culmination of eight months of work and hearings held by the Board of Regents. I think it is important to talk about some of the legal principles so that you understand the process the Board undertook. The Board's proposal, which was unanimously approved, complies with each of those legal requirements.

The ideal population is equal to the total state population divided by the total number of districts. There are 13 Regent districts, so dividing the total state population by the 13 districts gets an ideal population for a Regent's district of 207,735 people. In September, the Board had an in-depth hearing that included testimony. I provided background on all the legal principles. The first principle is that the population of districts can withstand a constitutional challenge only if there are minor deviations among the districts. A minor deviation is any plan with deviations of less than 10 percent, but even those deviations should be justified by traditional race-neutral principles we will talk about in just a moment.

A redistricting plan must not violate Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act—it must not be discriminatory against any person or group of persons on account of race, color, or status as a member of a language-minority group. A redistricting plan must avoid racial gerrymandering, which exists when race is the dominant and controlling rationale in drawing district lines and traditional race-neutral districting principles become subordinate to racial considerations.

What are those traditional race-neutral redistricting principles? They are all embodied not only in the plan you are looking at, A.B. 570, but in all the plans that have been discussed by the Board. Those traditional redistricting principles include:

- Compactness.
- Contiguity.
- The preservation of political subdivisions.
- The preservation of communities of interest.
- The preservation of cores of prior districts.
- The protection of incumbents—which means those elected to office have the right to continue their terms, and the people who elected those people to office have the right to be represented by the people they elected.
- Compliance with Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act.
- Must not be the result of political gerrymandering.

The last principle was not of great concern to the Board of Regents because the Board of Regents is a nonpartisan body.

We also looked at the Joint Rules of the Nevada Legislature. In September, we anticipated what those rules would look like by looking at the last round of redistricting, and the rules you adopted were quite similar. You indicated a plan should not exceed an overall range of population deviation of greater than 10 percent for legislative districts, and that no district should exceed plus or minus 5 percent from the ideal district. You also indicated that equality of population in accordance with the standard for state legislative plans is the redistricting goal for the Board of Regents. You will see that the overall population deviation of the plan we are going to look at is 0.40 percent, or 843 people total in the entire plan. We used the federal decennial census for the database for redistricting.

I want to talk about the public testimony the Board heard before coming to you with a redistricting plan. We held several public hearings. As I indicated, in September we talked about the legal principles. We purchased a copy of the software the Legislature was using. In December, we looked at a draft conceptual plan based purely on population, because population estimates do not contain reliable racial or ethnic data. We were just looking at population to see where the growth was and how the districts might look to reach an equal population standard. In fact, some of the districts presented in December look very similar to what you will see as we go through the districts.

The Board held hearings in March and April. As you know, budget issues are a major concern for this Legislature and the Board this session, and while we did not hear the redistricting plans at those times, the Board heard public comment, and statements were provided at both of those hearings. Finally, on May 6, a redistricting plan was presented to the Board that embodied the principles I just mentioned. That plan was unanimously approved and was also posted on your website. I have held meetings with various constituent groups and individuals, and many of their comments are reflected in the plan we will be looking at today. Obviously, not every comment can be reflected, because sometimes people have very different views concerning how a district should be drawn, and all views cannot be represented on every plan.

On slides 10 and 11 ([Exhibit C](#)), the only Nevada counties that lost population during the last decade were Esmeralda, Lander, and Mineral Counties. Elko, Churchill, Douglas, Humboldt, Pershing, and White Pine Counties along with Carson City had growth of between zero and 15 percent. Eureka, Lincoln, Storey, and Washoe Counties had growth of between 15 and 30 percent.

The largest growth occurred in Clark, Lyon, and Nye Counties with increases of between 30 and 50 percent. You will see these changes reflected in how the districts are going to be drawn.

One major issue is the distribution of the 13 Regent districts. In 2000, the population in Clark County was 1,375,765 people, which represented 69 percent of the state's population. Multiplying the 13 districts by 69 percent equaled 8.97. That is why there were 9 districts in Clark County, as that plan was approved by the Legislature in 2001 and amended in 2003. The rest of the state had 622,462 people, which was 31 percent of the state's population. Thirty-one percent of the 13 districts equaled 4.03, so 4 districts were located in the remainder of the state.

According to the 2010 Census, Clark County's population is 1,951,269, which is 72.25 percent of the state's population. Multiplying the 13 districts by 72.25 percent equals 9.39 districts, and that is what you will find in Clark County. It has 9.4 districts. If you drew 10 districts in Clark County, it would be overrepresented. If you drew 9 districts in Clark County, it would be underrepresented. The rest of the state has 27.75 percent of the population. Of 13 districts, that would be 3.61 districts, and that is what this plan presents. We would not round 3.61 percent up to 4 percent, because the rest of the state would be overrepresented. Nor would we round down to 3 districts, because the rest of the state would be underrepresented.

Looking at the 13 Regent districts and how population growth affected them on slide 15, the ideal population in 2000 for a Regent district was 153,712 people. In 2010, the ideal population is 207,735. In 10 of the 13 districts, there were substantial deficits in the number of people in those districts in order to be at the ideal population. Only 3 districts had more people than the ideal district. District 11 in Washoe County had 4,474 people more than it needed. Two districts had population to give to the rest of the state. One was District 12 in Clark County, which was 128,238 people over. District 13 was 100.1 percent over the ideal population. If we split District 13 in half, it would still have more people than it should, according to the ideal population, and that will factor in as we look at the individual districts.

In 2001, the overall population deviation of the Regents' districts was a respectable 3.81 percent, well under the 10 percent rule that was adopted by the Legislature at that time. In this plan, the overall deviation is 0.40 percent, or a total of 843 people.

Slide 17 ([Exhibit C](#)) discusses the distribution of racial and ethnic population in the state. I provide this for historical perspective and will reference it as we go through the districts, but I will not go through them in any detail at this time. This information is also on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS).

Slide 18 shows the communities of interest racial and ethnic data for the plan proposed under A.B. 570. I would note that District 1 in Clark County contained an African American population in 2000 of 26.68 percent. The African American population under the plan in A.B. 570 would be 27.46 percent. The district grew from 152,569 to 207,610 people—an increase of 55,041 people. That district also increased in African American population.

District 5 in Clark County is a majority/minority district and contains the majority Hispanic/Latino total population of 58.03 percent and a voting-age majority of 50.7 percent.

District 4 is the second majority/minority Hispanic/Latino majority district with 54.12 percent of the total population, and it contains 47.7 percent of the voting-age population.

District 2 has a significant Hispanic/Latino population of 31.83 percent, and Districts 6 and 13 have significant Asian populations of 16.56 and 15.35 percent respectively.

Looking at the statewide map on slide 19 ([Exhibit C](#)), it complies with the legal requirements as well as the spirit of the Voting Rights Act and the Joint Rules regarding population. With regard to preservation of political subdivisions, counties are whole with the exception of Washoe and Clark Counties. Both counties have multiple districts. Cities are kept whole where possible. For example, Sparks and Regent Geddes' district is kept whole. We will see preservation of communities of interest. The districts preserve the cores of prior districts. If you compare the districts now to ten years ago, they are very similar. The ten districts that needed to grow are obviously a little larger, and the two districts—12 and 13—that had significant additional population are the two that are going to look the most different in the plan. The plan also provides for continuance of incumbents in office, and the districts are contiguous and compact.

I greatly appreciate Kathy Steinle's help in installing the software on our system, providing all the updates, helping print the maps, and getting them

posted here in the Legislative Building. She also assisted with printing maps for posting at our Board meetings. I want to express the Board of Regent's appreciation for Kathy's help.

Going through the districts [slides 19 through 34 of the PowerPoint ([Exhibit C](#))], District 1 is represented by Regent Cedric Crear. That district had 152,569 people in 2001. In the 2010 Census it had 181,127, so it needed 26,608 people. Its boundaries grew north to include much more of North Las Vegas. It does not include all of North Las Vegas, as that would overpopulate the district, but it has increased in size to include the majority of North Las Vegas. That district is under populated by only 0.06, or 125 people.

District 2 is represented by Regent Robert Blakely. His district had a population of 153,856 in 2001. To reach the ideal 2010 district, it needed 49,627 more people. It now has a population deviation of only 49 people, or a 0.02 percent deviation. It generally grew to the north from West Craig Road to West Grand Teton Drive and south to West Sahara and includes a portion of West Flamingo.

District 3 is represented by Regent Kevin Page. His district contained 153,257 people in 2001 and needed 48,582 people in order to reach the ideal district. His district moved mostly south into what was formerly District 12 and added some population to the west. Its deviation is now only 329 people over the ideal population, or 0.16 percent.

District 4, a majority Hispanic district with 54.12 percent total Hispanic/Latino population, will be up for election in 2012 with no incumbent in that election, as Regent Mark Alden, who represents this district, will be term-limited. In 2001, this district had 153,141 people. It needed an additional 54,594 people, so it grew in area to the north in order to pick up that population.

District 5 is represented by Regent Jack Schofield. Jack Schofield is term-limited, so his seat will be an open seat in 2014. District 5 needed 63,624 people, which was the largest negative deviation of any of the districts, at -30.6 percent prior to this redistricting proposal. Under A.B. 570, District 5 picks up population from the east and west and has a total Hispanic/Latino population of 58 percent, up from 55.11 percent in 2001. It also contains a Hispanic/Latino voting-age majority of 50.75 percent and deviates from the ideal population by only -237 people, or 0.11 percent.

District 6 is represented by Regent Michael Wixom. If you recall, District 12 had 128,238 people over the ideal population, and District 13 had more than double the ideal population. District 6 absorbs portions of both those districts and now has 0.19 percent deviation, or 391 people over the ideal population.

District 7 is represented by Regent Mark Doubrava. It needed 45,674 people in order to reach the ideal population. It moved north to West Lone Mountain Road. It has 0.10 population deviation or 206 people more than the ideal district.

District 8 is represented by Regent Kevin Melcher. It needed 38,106 people. In addition, it lost Mineral, Esmeralda, Churchill, Lander, and Pershing Counties to Districts 9 and 11, which needed more people in order to reach their ideal district populations. District 8 is the Regent district that will consist of part of Clark County. It includes the more rural areas of Clark County as well as Mesquite, Moapa Valley, Nellis Air Force Base, and parts of what was District 13. It retains Elko, Eureka, Humboldt, Lincoln, Nye, and White Pine Counties.

District 9 is represented by Regent Ron Knecht. It consisted of Carson City; Storey, Douglas, and Lyon Counties; and part of southern Washoe County. District 9 needed 19,667 people to reach the ideal district. Churchill, Lander, Mineral, and Esmeralda Counties have been added to District 9, and it is now within 0.22 percent, or 452 people of the ideal population.

District 10 is represented by Regent Bill Cobb and needed 28,344 people. It moved south to the Mount Rose Highway, which is the beginning of Regent Knecht's district. It added areas adjacent to Interstate 80 that are located in Reno from District 11. Its population deviation is now 0.15 percent, or -305 people.

District 11 is represented by Regent Jason Geddes. Regent Geddes' district was 4,474 people over the ideal population, but parts of his existing district were moved into District 10, so District 11 continues to include areas in Reno north of Interstate 80 and all of Sparks. Pershing County was also added to bring the population to within 180 people of the ideal population, or 0.09 percent.

District 12 is represented by Regent Andrea Anderson. It was the second largest district at 128,238 people over the ideal. Because Districts 12 and 13 were so overpopulated, and because other districts had to grow into those areas, Districts 12 and 13 are going to have the most dramatic decreases in

population and land size. District 12 now consists of all the populated areas of Boulder City, part of Henderson, and the Paradise area in Las Vegas. Its population is within 130 people of the ideal population, or 0.06 percent.

District 13, represented by Regent James Dean Leavitt, was the largest district of growth between 2000 and 2010. It was 100.1 percent over the ideal population, so it has had the most dramatic change. It is going to be half the size of what it was before. It now consists of portions that were not reassigned or redistricted to the other districts under the proposal in A.B. 570. It consists of Summerlin South areas, areas to the west of Route 215, and areas north of Districts 2 and 7 and south of Districts 5 and 7. Its population is now within 17 people of the ideal population, for a deviation of 0.01 percent.

Referring again to the time line, in September we talked about the legal requirements. The redistricting software that the Legislature is using was purchased, so we were able to look at the population estimates. In December, we reviewed those population estimates and the draft conceptual plan. We received the statewide populations at the end of the year. At the beginning of this legislative session you adopted your Joint Rules, so we knew the rules to follow. On February 24, the U.S. Census Bureau provided the census block-level data to the state Legislature. The Legislative Counsel Bureau validated that information, and that is the information we used in creating our districts. We heard additional public comment in our March and April Board meetings, and on May 6, the Board approved the redistricting plan. That brings us to today, where we are presenting the plan found in A.B. 570. We are hopeful that on or before June 6, the Legislature will enact into law the Board of Regents' redistricting plan.

Chair Segerblom:

Are there any questions for Mr. Wasserman?

Senator Cegavske:

Thank you, Scott, and it was a pleasure working with you. Was there any consideration given to changing the number of regents—possibly to 9 or something lower, or even to 11? Did that discussion come up at all?

Scott Wasserman:

There has been some discussion about the size of the Board. It was fairly brief. Questions were raised about either increasing or decreasing the size of the Board. With regard to increasing the size of the Board, I indicated that there did not seem to be legislative support in the past for increasing the number of members of the Board. I do not think the Board itself was looking to increase

the numbers of its members. Decreasing the number was not seriously considered. When you decrease the numbers, you must be careful what impact that would have on certain provisions of the Voting Rights Act, so we did not spend a great deal of time looking at either proposal. I presented a plan that had 13 districts and was not directed to bring a different plan.

Senator Settlemeyer:

Did you go with the initial plan you submitted, or have any changes been made since that time? Some of the numbers seem a little bit different than in the first proposal.

Scott Wasserman:

There were changes in the plan as the Board looked at it and as I met with constituent groups. There was also a slight change in the community of interest in District 5 in the final plan you now have before you in A.B. 570.

Senator Settlemeyer:

Were the changes made since it was sent to us or before it got to us?

Scott Wasserman:

The last change was after the plan that was provided by the Board of Regents and introduced in A.B. 570.

Senator Settlemeyer:

What was the reason for the change to District 5?

Scott Wasserman:

A larger portion of the Clark High School service area was identified as needing to be included within the same community of interest. It was about 45,000 people. That area was expanded and included in District 5.

Assemblyman Stewart:

Was the vote of the Board unanimous on this plan?

Scott Wasserman:

Yes, the vote was unanimous by the Board.

Chair Segerblom:

Are there any further questions? [There was no response.] Would anyone here or in the south like to speak? [There was no response.]

Thank you, Mr. Wasserman, for your presentation. I will close the hearing on A.B. 570. With the Assembly Committee's permission, I would like to introduce BDR 34-1302, which is the State Board of Education maps.

BDR 34-1302—Revises the districts from which members of the State Board of Education are elected. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 573](#).)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SMITH MOVED FOR COMMITTEE INTRODUCTION OF BDR 34-1302.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN FLORES SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Now we will turn to Mr. Stewart and Ms. Steinle for another presentation.

Michael J. Stewart, Supervising Principal Research Analyst:

Joining me today is Kathy Steinle, Manager of the Legislative Counsel Bureau's (LCB) Information Technology Services unit. As we have done in the past, we have been asked to provide factual information regarding certain reapportionment and redistricting plans that have been compiled for consideration by this Joint Committee.

Before we begin, I must make the LCB disclosure that, as 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 merely to present basic factual information about redistricting plans for the State Board of Education based on suggestions from various parties.

As we have in the past, Kathy will start today with an explanation of the key geographic components and features of the proposed plan and some district-specific information. I will follow up with a brief summary of statistical information specifically with regard to population and information regarding race and ethnic-minority concentrations in some of the Board of Education districts.

Kathy Steinle, GIS Manager, Information Technology Services:

This plan has ten districts. The Board of Education has ten districts. Looking at the statewide map ([Exhibit D](#)), only two counties are split in this plan—Washoe and Clark Counties. Clark County has seven wholly contained districts, and Washoe County has one district wholly contained and part of another one.

District 10 contains only whole counties, and those are Churchill, Douglas, Elko, Esmeralda, Eureka, Lander, Lincoln, Lyon, Mineral, Nye, Storey, and White Pine. None of those counties are split. The district in the northwest corner of the state is District 9. It contains all of Carson City as well as all of Humboldt and Pershing Counties and part of Washoe County.

Looking at the Reno/Sparks area ([Exhibit E](#)), this is District 8. It is wholly contained within Washoe County. Moving to the Clark County/Las Vegas area ([Exhibit F](#)), Districts 1 through 7 are wholly contained within Clark County.

Michael Stewart:

Turning to the statistical information with regard to the Board of Education plan ([Exhibit G](#)), the ideal population of the plan for each district is 270,055 people. The largest positive deviation in the plan is 3.47 percent in District 6 in Clark County. The largest negative deviation is -7.68 percent in District 10, which is the rural district. That equals an overall range of deviation of 11.15 percent.

Turning to the racial and ethnic report, two districts have notable Hispanic/Latino populations. Those are District 5 with 52.85 percent and District 6 with 38.34 percent. Notable African American populations exist in proposed District 3 at 24.96 percent. District 4 has an Asian population at 21.06 percent.

Chair Segerblom:

Ms. Steinle, can you summarize your involvement in this process? How did it start?

Kathy Steinle:

As staff, we were asked to put together a plan.

Chair Segerblom:

Asked by whom?

Kathy Steinle:

We actually worked with Carol Stonefield and Patrick Guinan of the Research Division. We also worked with Keith Rheault of the Department of Education. We met with Mr. Rheault and gave him a couple of different plans that he reviewed. Mr. Rheault had several requests and ideas for how the plan should evolve, which we took back, and we met those requests. At that point, we brought the plans to you all, and you had us make several other adjustments. That is the plan you see today.

Chair Segerblom:

Do all the incumbents have seats?

Kathy Steinle:

Yes, they do. That was one of the requests—if possible, to maintain the districts with their incumbents.

Chair Segerblom:

Thank you. I also want to ask Ms. O'Grady a question. This plan actually has a deviation higher than the normal 10 percent. That was done at my request. Because the State Board of Education deals with school districts and school districts are based on counties, we tried to make all the lines fit within counties. Clark County has approximately 73 percent of the state's population, so we put seven districts wholly within Clark County. That changed the numbers, that 1 percent extra. Ms. O'Grady, as staff attorney, will you give us some background and tell us if that will be permissible.

Eileen O'Grady, Committee Counsel:

The redistricting rules in the Joint Rules provide that compliance with the same standards as for legislative districts is the goal for drawing the State Board of Education districts.

The requirement of equal population for state legislative districts stems from the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment to the *United States Constitution*. In drawing state legislative districts, the U.S. Supreme Court has interpreted this to require the achieving of "substantial equality of population among the various districts." The Supreme Court has never specifically said what "substantial" means, but through case law it has become generally accepted that the population difference between the largest and smallest districts be no more than 10 percent, which is known as the "10 percent rule." This is a burden-shifting standard. If a redistricting plan has a total deviation of less than 10 percent, it is presumed constitutional and the burden of proof would be on the challengers to prove that the plan is unconstitutional. If the total deviation is greater than 10 percent and the plan is challenged, the burden shifts to the state to justify the deviation. To meet this burden, the state must show that the deviation was necessary to implement a "rational state policy." To date, the only such "rational state policy" recognized by the U.S. Supreme Court is the preservation of political subdivisions.

Chair Segerblom:

County lines and school board districts would constitute political subdivisions, right?

Eileen O'Grady:

Correct, because they are coterminous with the county lines.

Chair Segerblom:

It will be a Committee decision as to whether it wants to go beyond the 10 percent. Again, this deviation is based on trying to have the State Board of Education districts wholly within a school district. Otherwise, we would have to take that large district in the middle of the state and pull it into Clark County. It would be possible that someone from Clark County could be elected to represent the rurals. We felt it would be better to make sure the rural districts would be represented by someone from a rural county.

Are there any questions?

Assemblyman Stewart:

Did the State Board of Education approve this plan?

Chair Segerblom:

Mr. Rheault would have to answer that. Mr. Rheault, will you please come to the table?

Keith Rheault, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education:

The State Board has not officially approved all districts, but I met with legislative staff, and the proposed districts I see here meet the Board's request perfectly.

The Board had two requests. Since eight of the ten Board members are first-term members, they wanted the opportunity to run again in their districts, and that is addressed in this plan. All of them are within their current districts. The second request made was to preserve county districts in their State Board districts as much as possible. There are seven school board districts in the Clark County area, one school board district for the rural area, and two school board districts in the northwest part of the state. I think that was really their concern. They did not want to spend a lot of time on the minute details of what the districts were. It is nonpartisan. Also, there were several bills introduced this legislative session that were either going to eliminate the Board or change the election process for Board members. They put full faith in

Legislative Counsel Bureau staff, and it is reflected in this bill. As secretary to the Board, I think it exactly meets what they were looking for.

Senator Settlemeyer:

Mention was made about following school district boundaries. How often do those change?

Keith Rheault:

School district boundaries are county districts, and I do not think they have changed in the 25 years I have been at the Department.

Assemblyman Hickey:

Dr. Rheault, since some of the legislation you referred to talks about a possible combination of appointments and elections to the School Board, was that discussed at all within your Board? How might that work out if one of those bills passed?

Keith Rheault:

Yes, it has been a topic of discussion over the past year and a half. I think they would prefer to stay with the ten elected districts. As part of a study done during the interim, one proposal suggested a combination of four Board members elected based on congressional districts and three Board members appointed. The Board agreed to support that as a compromise, if that was the Legislature's wish. I do know they are in total opposition to a fully appointed Board.

Assemblyman Hardy:

On our Clark County map, District 5 is a horseshoe shape that wraps around District 6, while District 3 drops south alongside District 5. Is there a reason for that configuration?

Keith Rheault:

District 5 is member Stavan Corbett's district. He represents a Hispanic area of Las Vegas and is of Hispanic descent. Even though the boundary wraps around, I think it is representative of that district, as far as I can tell.

Chair Segerblom:

Are there any other questions? [There was no response.] Ms. Steinle, you did a great job, and Mr. Stewart, you did a great job, too.

Is there any public comment on BDR 34-1302 either in the north or the south? [There was no response.] We will close the hearing on BDR 34-1302.

Assembly Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections
Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections
May 24, 2011
Page 16

Are there any questions from the Committee members? [There were none.]
Are there any questions from the public? [There were none.] Then we are
adjourned [at 4:27 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 24, 2011

Time of Meeting: 3:40 p.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
A.B. 570	C	Scott Wasserman	PowerPoint
BDR 34-1302	D	Kathy Steinle	Statewide Map of Proposed Board of Education Districts
BDR 34-1302	E	Kathy Steinle	Reno/Sparks Area Map
BDR 34-1302	F	Kathy Steinle	Clark County/Las Vegas Area Map
BDR 34-1302	G	Michael Stewart	Statistical Information