

**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
April 2, 2011**

The Joint Assembly Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections and Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections was called to order by Chair Tick Segerblom at 10:01 a.m. on Saturday, April 2, 2011, in Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. The meeting was also videoconferenced to Room 4100 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada, as well as to Great Basin College, 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 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 Barbara K. Cegavske

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblyman Pat Hickey (excused)
Assemblyman James Ohrenschall (excused)
Senator Steven A. Horsford (excused)
Senator James A. Settelmeyer (excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Paul Aizley, Clark County Assembly District No. 41
Assemblyman Elliot Anderson, Clark County Assembly District No. 15
Assemblyman Steven Brooks, Clark County Assembly District No. 19
Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Clark County Assembly District No. 14
Assemblyman Richard Carrillo, Clark County Assembly District No. 18
Assemblyman Jason Frierson, Clark County Assembly District No. 8
Assemblyman Joseph Hogan, Clark County Assembly District No. 10
Assemblywoman Dina Neal, Clark County Assembly District No. 7
Senator Greg Brower, Washoe County Senatorial District No. 3
Senator Ruben Kihuen, Clark County Senatorial District No. 10

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
Terry Horgan, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Ellen Spiegel, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Rozita Villanueva Lee, National Vice Chair, National Federation of Filipino
American Associations
Maria Chairez, Principal, Quannah McCall Empowerment Elementary
School, North Las Vegas, Nevada

Matt McCarty, Chairman, Government Affairs Committee, Elko Area Chamber of Commerce
Linda West Myers, representing GoWest Institute and the Chapel of 4 Chaplains
Ed Gobel, representing GoWest Institute
Vicenta Montoya, representing Sí Se Puede Latino Democratic Caucus
Andrew Murphy, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Robert Henry, Vice President, Filipino American Chamber of Commerce of Greater Nevada
Joe Neal, representing the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People
Yvette Williams, Chair, Clark County Black Caucus
Artie Blanco, Nevada State Director, Mi Familia Vota
Howard Watts, representing the Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada
John Lacenere, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Annette Teijeiro, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Dwayne Chesnut, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Kenneth King, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Kenneth Rowley, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Daniel Braisted, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Andres Ramirez, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Leonard Marciano, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Rosemary Flores, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Devon Brooks, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Ralph Sacrison, Private Citizen, Elko, Nevada
Sylvia Lazos, Cochair, Southern Nevada Diversity Roundtable; Professor of Law, William S. Boyd School of Law, University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Chair Segerblom:

[Roll was taken.] Good morning. I want to thank you for coming to our last hearing on redistricting. We are going to have a brief presentation from staff, and then we will ask you to tell us what you think we should do with redistricting.

Michael J. Stewart, Supervising Principal Research Analyst:

You have already had several of these presentations. For this one, we are going to show you some of the statistical information concerning reapportionment and redistricting and give you a brief summary of population statistics and other Census-related information you may be interested in as you go through this reapportionment process.

This first slide ([Exhibit C](#)) is a line graph and is a pretty telling depiction of the increase in Nevada's population since 1990. The next slide shows the raw numbers; you can see that we are still experiencing considerable growth. Although the 35.1 percent growth in the last ten years has been the smallest growth rate since 1940, I would point out that it is still a growth rate of over 700,000 people in the State of Nevada. As I mentioned in previous reapportionment hearings, this growth rate is something you have to take into consideration as you do the reapportionment process.

Chair Segerblom asked what the ideal population would be in all the districts to be redrawn by the Nevada Legislature. The ideal population for the four House of Representatives districts for 2010 would be 675,138. You can see how that compared to over 600,000 for the two districts in 1990 and 660,000 for three districts in 2000.

In terms of the Nevada State Senate, in 2010 you are looking at an ideal population, assuming a 21-member plan, of 128,598. We have had 21 Senate Districts since 1981. For the Nevada State Assembly, based on 2010 population, the ideal population in each district would be 64,299.

As you know, the Legislature is also tasked with redrawing the lines for the Board of Regents and the State Board of Education/State Board for Career and Technical Education. The ideal population for a Board of Regents district would be 207,235, assuming there are still 13 districts. Assuming the status quo of ten members on the State Board of Education, the ideal population would be just over 270,000.

There has been discussion about what percentage of Assembly and Senate districts will be shifted from the north and the rural areas to the south assuming the same number of Senate and Assembly members. Currently, Clark County has 14 Senate districts plus another one-half of a district. Under the new 2010 Census-based redistricting, assuming a 21-member plan, that is going to shift upwards and increase by about three-quarters of a district. So for Washoe County and the balance of the state, there would be a decline of three-quarters of a Senate district. Looking at the Assembly, there would be an increase in the number of Assembly districts in Clark County from 28.92 to 30.35—roughly a 1¼-district increase—with a comparable decline for Washoe County and the balance of the state.

As you know, there has been some interest in racial and ethnicity data. This is another criteria you must take into consideration when doing reapportionment and redistricting, largely pursuant to the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (VRA). We

have broken out the racial data into percentages and population numbers. You will probably note that these totals will not add up to 1.9 million people because during this last Census, the Census Bureau allowed people to select more than one race. The same data is presented for Washoe County and also for the remaining counties.

For the public's interest, I would like to point out some Internet websites that are going to be very useful for the public. Our Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) staff has been pretty good about making sure we put as much as we can on the websites. If you go to our website—< <http://www.leg.state.nv.us> >—you can pull up our Legislature's homepage. Halfway down on the left-hand side, there is a tab for reapportionment and redistricting. Clicking on that, we have a website that shows information such as our public hearings, maps showing some of the data I just highlighted, and also some statistical information that includes all sorts of charts from the Census Bureau. It also includes an interactive map that can be manipulated, information about each county, and information about ideal population. Fact sheets and publications are also on the website. The fact sheets have been updated and are an exciting new addition to our website. We also have a couple of newsletters and other publications, including the "Reapportionment and Redistricting Bulletin No. 11-04" that highlights the activities of the Interim Study on Reapportionment. If you are interested, you can go to a different website and see everything the Legislature did ten years ago when it created the current districts. There is a tab with historic information as well.

I would also encourage the public to click on the little area at the top left to sign up for information. If you are interested in being notified about any hearings both of these Committees have, just go to that link and sign up for any sort of information you would like. We will put you on the mailing list for public hearings and Committee meetings. Also, feel free to contact the Legislature. Our staff list is right there.

Chair Segerblom:

To summarize, Nevada's population has continued to creep to Clark County. All things being equal, if the districts we draw are of equal size, more Assembly seats and more Senate seats would be in Clark County. Washoe and the rural areas would lose, although not significant numbers. Is that correct?

Michael Stewart:

That is correct. About $\frac{3}{4}$ of a Senate seat and about $1\frac{1}{4}$ of an Assembly seat would go to Clark County.

Chair Segerblom:

Are there any other questions for Mr. Stewart? [There were none.] Now, we will ask Kathy Steinle from our Information Technology Division to make her presentation.

Kathy Steinle, GIS Manager, Information Technology Services:

You have seen a demonstration of our redistricting software a few times now. I am going to try something a little different this time. We are going to start with an empty plan, and I will give a quick overview for the public. Our redistricting software is written by a company named Citygate GIS and the software is called autoBound. It sits on top of Esri's ArcView 9/10 GIS software.

If you look up at the screen, our map is in the center, and on the left are our redistricting tools. There are quite a few of them; we can do a lot of different things with this. At the bottom is our table. As we build districts, the table will show us what those populations are, what the target ranges are, and how many people must be added or removed to reach a target district. All the race categories Michael mentioned are included—American Indian, whites, blacks, Hispanics, Asian, native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander, others, and those who are of more than two races. We have a lot of racial data available from the Census Bureau. We also have voter registration data for three years—from 2010, 2008, and 2006. It shows the total registered—how many Democrats, how many Republicans, how many nonpartisans, and how many others. We have also collected data for four election races. Two of those races, Reid-Angle for U.S. Senate and Marshall-Martin for State Treasurer, are from 2010. We have data on the presidential race from 2008 and on the governor's race from 2006, so as you build your districts, you are going to have this data.

Our goal is to create districts with equal population within a reasonable deviation. Since we are going to start with a Senate district today, we take our total state population of 2,700,551 and divide it by 21, so our target population is 128,598. Since we are meeting in the City of Las Vegas, I am going to build a Senate district in Clark County, and as I zoom in, I get more information such as local streets. There is everything in this software so you can tell where you are. The whole premise of the software is to select areas of geography you want to add people to. The current district is going to be No. 1. You also get to choose at what level you add geography to this district. You can grab entire counties, you can grab precincts, or you can go down to the census block level. Today, I am going to work with the precincts.

I want to take a moment to show you some of the other tools we have available. Michael referred to some of the maps we have on our website. We have done racial maps for each of the race groups, and you can see the concentrations. This one happens to be the current Senate districts showing the African American population. You can see in this example, that Senate District 4 is heavily shaded, so it has more than compared to Senate District 8. Another tool is pie charts, and this one shows Hispanic populations. The purple is non-Hispanic and the gold is Hispanic. For example, this precinct is Hispanic whereas this other precinct is three-quarters non-Hispanic.

I am going to start grabbing precincts, but it would be nice if I could see how many people are in these precincts. I am going to label the precincts with total population so I know how many people I am picking up. These numbers represent how many people live in this precinct. For example, this precinct has 2,093 people. Another tool I have can look at several data fields at once, so I selected my total population. I can now show the white, Hispanic, and black populations all in ratio to each other as I build this district. I am going to start in the middle and grab some areas. As you can see, I have grabbed 48,381 people. Red is the total population; the green represents whites, blue represents Hispanic, and yellow represents the black population. What I am going to do is assign these to my district and I want you to watch the table at the bottom. You can see that the table is live. As I add areas, it changes.

I added 48,000 people, but I still have about 80,000 people to go. I updated my table when I just grabbed another 57,000 people, so I will assign those to my district. I still need about 25,000 people. Now you can see that I went over a little bit and am up by 11,000, so what I can do is unassign some areas—change my district. Now my deviation is no longer red; it turned green, because it is plus or minus the 5 percent—which is how the software is set up.

Let us take a look at these numbers again. This district I arbitrarily drew is 49.5 percent Hispanic, 44.4 percent white, 19.3 percent black, 0.9 percent American Indian, 4.3 percent Asian, and 0.5 percent Hawaiian and Pacific Islander. The voter registration for this district is 62.1 percent Democratic and 17.9 percent Republican. The election data for 2010 shows that 73.5 percent voted for Reid and 22.7 percent voted for Angle. That gives you a quick idea of how the software works.

Chair Segerblom:

Can you tell everyone how they can access this software?

Kathy Steinle:

We have contact information on the redistricting and reapportionment website. The bottom of the homepage lists the two public workstations available. One is in the Grant Sawyer State Office Building in Las Vegas, and the other is in the Legislative Building in Carson City. The phone numbers for the two locations are listed. You can call, set up an appointment, and use the software. We will assist you. We will train you so you can do it yourself, or we will sit down with you and you can tell us where you want to move the boundaries. You can do this for the whole state, or you can just do an area you are interested in. You can look at any areas you want. These workstations are open to the public and anyone can come in and utilize them. We have had quite a bit of use on the workstation in Las Vegas.

Chair Segerblom:

The workstation in Las Vegas is just behind the door, right? Just check in with the receptionist on the fourth floor and it is available. I would encourage everyone to try it out and draw your own district.

Kathy Steinle:

On the website, the racial concentration maps for the Assembly and Senate I referred to are under our maps tab.

Assemblywoman Dina Neal, Clark County Assembly District No. 7:

How do you select the population for an existing district? How do you select the percentage that will be part of the growth or part of the reversion? I want to see an existing district and see how it grows or shrinks. Is that possible?

Kathy Steinle:

We can also start from existing districts. From the tables, you can see which districts need to add population and which need to give away population. Your district has 2,724 people over the target deviation of 64,299. That means any of the districts around you can take some of that population away to add to theirs. For example, District 6 needs to add 19,000, so it could potentially take some of your district. When you start with current districts, there is a domino effect. I started with Assemblyman Segerblom's District 9 for one of the first demos I did. He needed to grow out, but in effect we made another district too small, so that district had to grow out. A lot of times, if you are starting with current districts, starting in the center and going out is sometimes the best way to go.

Chair Segerblom:

Are there any other questions? [There was no response.] At this point, we will open the meeting to public comment. We have a lot of people signed in, so could you come forward three at a time. We ask that you limit your comments to three minutes, if you can, but we really want to hear from you. If you have submitted anything that is on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS), please let us know that before you start speaking.

Ellen Spiegel, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am here to speak with you about redistricting as a women's issue. I have a quote from the 2012 Project of the Center for American Women and Politics (CAWP) at Rutgers University:

The U.S. has a poor track record of electing women, and the last election only underscores the problem. The number of women in Congress remained virtually the same at 17 percent, and the number of women in state legislatures declined by nearly 100 seats—the sharpest drop since the CAWP began tracking numbers nearly four decades ago. Internationally, the U.S. ranks 71st in terms of women's representation.

From a public policy perspective, the underrepresentation of women has a definite impact on policy making, and as the lines are redrawn, I implore you to consider the impact of the new lines on incumbent women in Nevada in both parties and in both houses.

Please do not make it more difficult, or impossible, for incumbent women to win reelection. I would like to briefly share two stories from two redistricting cycles that illustrate how redistricting can adversely affect elected women. Please keep in mind that women already do not hold office in numbers proportionate to their population numbers.

First, I would like to tell you about Joyce Brinkman, a Republican from Indianapolis, Indiana. Ms. Brinkman was the ranking minority house member of the committee responsible for redrawing the lines. Despite her rank, she was drawn into a district with two other incumbents. In that same election cycle, Utah women heard rumors that half of the 12 women in the state's 104-member legislature would be hurt by various redistricting proposals. A coalition of 15 women's groups took action and helped ensure that nine of those seats were drawn fairly for the incumbents.

I have been spending considerable time and some personal expense to increase awareness of redistricting as a women's issue. I may have already spoken with you personally, you may have seen one of my presentations on this topic, or you may have been lobbied on this issue last month during the Nevada Women's Lobby Grassroots Lobby Days. If not, I would be happy to meet or speak with you further about this issue. This is not a Democratic or Republican issue, and this is not a northern Nevada versus southern Nevada issue. This is a women's issue. According to the U.S. Census' American Community Survey five-year estimates for 2005-2009, women comprised 49.1 percent of Nevada's population, yet only five of our state Senators, 23.8 percent, and 12 of our state Assembly members, 28.6 percent, are women. Women are currently underrepresented in the Nevada Legislature. I urge you to consider the impact of your work on incumbent women.

Chair Segerblom:

Are there any questions for Ms. Spiegel? [There was no response.]

Rozita Villanueva Lee, National Vice Chair, National Federation of Filipino American Associations:

We know that in 2000, the State of Nevada had a population of 1,998,257. The Asian American population in that year was 112,458. In 2010, the population for Nevada is more than 2 million and the Asian Pacific American population is 242,916. This accounts for about 18.6 percent of the growth in our community. The growth in the Asian American/Pacific Islanders (AAPIs) as a group is almost 116 percent.

Every one of you in the Assembly has an Asian Pacific American in your district, but not enough to show that we make a dent or are a force. However, with this increase in numbers, we are a force now to be contended with. We all know that the State of Nevada was the fastest growing state in the nation for the past ten years, and part of that growth is attributed to the thousands of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders who chose to move here for various reasons. You see them working in hotels, in casinos, at conventions, and in schools as teachers and also as students. You avail yourselves of their services, for many are professionals. They are doctors, dentists, attorneys, psychiatrists, and college professors, and they provide senior services. They even fix your automobiles and take care of your children while you work.

Thousands of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders knocked on doors for the Census Bureau. Without them, we would not have had the kind of responses we had during this past Census period. We hired many who spoke different languages and dialects to communicate with the many immigrants who would

not have filled out the forms otherwise. We, as Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, contribute to the economy of Nevada, and in many instances, three or more in one family go to work to contribute to the family income, which is then spent in the markets, on insurance, in the malls, and on taxes for Nevada. We vote. We take part in the electoral process, but we know there are improvements to be made to increase the percentage of Asian Americans going to the polls, and we have groups working on voter education, registration, motivation, and protection. The Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance has been providing workshops on voter education and has hired people to encourage registration and voting.

This redistricting process is important to us. We want to be included. We know that maps will be redrawn in light of the results of the recent Census numbers. We know that in the past, in some states, significant Asian American populations were split into different districts, thereby affecting their voting power. We trust that this will not happen in this state. We want to be sure that in the drawing of districts we can elect representatives of choice to sit on our school boards, on city councils, in the State Legislature, and in Congress. We look forward to equitable consideration being given to the Asian American and Pacific Islander communities, because these redrawn lines can influence whether our elected officials respond to our needs, such as equal educational opportunities and health care. I would like to share some comments that were sent to me by people who could not attend today's meeting.

From Toby:

Redistricting will define how key reforms and policies are decided for the next ten years, and with the Asian American and Pacific Islander population growing, outpacing Hispanics in many places, this is an important way to make sure our government can help solve our everyday problems.

Chow Lee says:

In my opinion, being involved in the redistricting process is critical both for enhancing the Asian American and Pacific Islander community's visibility and as an exercise of the political rights to which we, as citizens of a representative democracy, are entitled. Unfortunately, due to deeply engrained cultural values and language barriers faced by many within the AAPI community, it is nearly impossible for them to fully participate in this democratic process. For those blessed with language proficiency and the

educational tools to effectively advocate for our fellow AAPIs, this is the opportunity to make sure Nevada's future leaders do not have an excuse to ignore the growing, pressing needs of AAPIs. The government needs to understand that whatever public resources are out there may not be sufficient, because they were not designed with the unique interests and needs of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in mind. Much like how I wondered why my law school has Spanish legal information classes, but no Cantonese or Mandarin equivalents; this is the type of concern we want our legislators to be thinking about. In order to achieve this, there needs to be greater activism and participation by those able and qualified to do so. We owe it to ourselves, and to the community at large, to help improve the living standards of our fellow Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders and preserve the diversity that this state needs to support its economic recovery.

Several of the people in our community have helped with this presentation and with charts showing where we stand as Asian American/Pacific Islanders. I want to point out this particular chart that shows the different Asian communities—Asian Indians, Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, native Hawaiian, Pacific Islanders, and others—which was prepared by our attorney, Jude Nazareth. I hope you will give consideration to this information, and that those actually doing the redrawing will consider the Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders who live here.

Chair Segerblom:

Thank you, Ms. Lee. I urge you to look at the Census data in the computer and see if there are areas where Asian Americans dominate, so we can try to make sure those are not split into separate districts. Are there any questions for Ms. Lee?

Assemblywoman Flores:

Can you give us a general sense where, in the Las Vegas or Clark County areas, most of the Asian American population is concentrated?

Rozita Lee:

It is really difficult, but the businesses are concentrated on Spring Mountain Road, from east to west, and the area keeps expanding. Many people also live in the City of Henderson and in Summerlin. These are new people who have moved here because these are the new developments.

**Maria Chairez, Principal, Quannah McCall Empowerment Elementary School,
North Las Vegas, Nevada:**

Our school is located in the City of North Las Vegas. It is near the corner of Donna Street and Carey Avenue. Our school has 524 students. We would like our school to be seen not just as a place where students learn, but as a community. It is not where you drop your students off and pick them up at the end of the day. Our school is more than an academic center; it is a place where we connect families. We believe our schools are the center points where communities of interest are defined. Our families do not want our school divided and chopped up like a tomato. We want it to be kept whole. We would like to keep the surrounding areas of our school intact so we can represent and organize around our interests.

I am speaking on behalf of 128 parents who are asking that the outer boundary where Quannah McCall is located be Evans Avenue and the southeast boundary be Lake Mead Boulevard instead of Carey Avenue. We would like the east boundary to be Las Vegas Boulevard and the west boundary to be Interstate 15, which is a natural divider. I have a letter for you, a map, and a petition signed by our parents ([Exhibit D](#)). We are asking that our community be kept intact for reapportionment and redistricting purposes. When you draw these lines, we also ask that you look at us as a community of interest. As I understand it, a community of interest is where families get services, identify as a group, and are able to organize and have an identity. Our school is such a place.

As you draw the lines, consider the demographic data. Thirty-eight percent of our area's families do not have a high school graduate, and another 40 percent speak a language other than English. We have common needs, and if we keep our community intact, we will be able to have one person represent our interests, whether that be an Assemblyman, a Senator, or a U.S. House Member. We have talked about redistricting as a school, and we have talked about it as a community. So as you go about looking at data, please consider our needs.

Chair Segerblom:

Before we go any farther, I would like to acknowledge the legislators in attendance today who are not members of our Committees: Senator Kihuen, Senator Brower, Assemblyman Aizley, Assemblyman Frierson, Assemblyman Hogan, Assemblywoman Neal, Assemblyman Carrillo, Assemblyman Anderson, Assemblyman Brooks, and Assemblywoman Carlton.

I cannot tell from the monitor. Are there people in Elko who want to speak?

Matt McCarty, Chairman, Government Affairs Committee, Elko Area Chamber of Commerce:

[From prepared text ([Exhibit E](#)), Matt McCarty read the Elko Area Chamber of Commerce's position that the rural areas of Nevada constitute a community of interest and that every effort should be made to maintain the integrity of the rural areas.]

Chair Segerblom:

Is there anyone else in Elko who wants to make a presentation?

Matt McCarty:

Not at this time. Unfortunately, it is such a large district geographically that it is hard to get everyone together.

Chair Segerblom:

You adequately and very fairly represented your interests. Thank you so much.

We will resume testimony here in the south.

Linda West Myers, representing GoWest Institute and the Chapel of 4 Chaplains:

We very much appreciate the opportunity to participate in this process. Our plan ([Exhibit F](#)) is for a stronger voice for the entire State of Nevada in Washington, for unity of understanding and action of our entire Congressional delegation. With each representative responsible for a portion of our largest population center, Clark County, as well as several other counties, the interests of our entire state can truly be represented.

As you can see from our map and accompanying charts ([Exhibit G](#)), in Congressional District 1 (CD 1) we have Clark, Nye, Esmeralda, Mineral, and Douglas Counties as well as Carson City. District 2 contains Clark, Nye, Churchill, Lyon, and Storey Counties. In District 3 we cover Clark, Nye, Lincoln, Eureka, Humboldt, Lander, Pershing, Washoe, Churchill, and Lyon Counties. District 4 would cover Clark, Lincoln, White Pine, and Elko Counties. For the sake of contiguity of the districts, we have divided some counties.

Here, we have an amazing opportunity to act for all the people of Nevada and show that our unity as Nevadans is stronger than any partisan approach to reapportioning our Congressional districts. We truly appreciate the assistance of the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) staff in guiding us through that amazing new software. They were invaluable to our efforts. Now I would like to introduce my brother, Ed Gobel.

Ed Gobel, representing GoWest Institute:

Thank you for allowing us to speak. As I look at this Joint Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections, every possible position that has already spoken has representation on this Committee. That is phenomenal. No state in the nation can say that it does better than we do even now, but we are going to do better.

That is what our plan is about. We are here to present our Congressional redistricting plan, which is different than any yet presented. We live in the greatest state in the nation, whose motto is "All For Our Country." And no, when we first started teaching the Bill of Rights, we could not find a single teacher who knew that the state motto was not "Battle Born."

As a disabled Vietnam veteran, I am proud to be here to hear all the different interests speak and fight for their populations. What our districting would do is divide the state into four districts. In 2011 we have a great opportunity, and it is a critical time in the State of Nevada, as you on the Committee know better than anyone else. What other people see as a crisis is an opportunity for growth that will help all Nevada citizens.

Should Clark County continue to maintain its vast influence? Well, with 72 percent of the population, obviously, yes, but that does not mean that we suddenly throw the rurals and other areas into an abyss. The way we get better influence in Congress is by having a unified delegation where every Congressional district has intimate knowledge of what is going on in the state. The resources from different areas have helped the south grow, and the revenue from the south has helped the north grow.

We need to end the north-versus-south infighting. That does not mean we want to create east-west infighting by creating four districts that spread horizontally across the state. Each district we drew would contain a sliver of Clark County, and our plan ends a lot of fragmentation. If you look at the first chart on page 2 ([Exhibit G](#)), you will see that we come within a 0.01 percent difference in each district. In addition, when we planned this, we got all kinds of demographic information that shows we are also accounting for future growth.

If you notice the distribution of population on page 3, we tried to create an innovative chart. We took the population that would be included from Clark County in each district versus outside Clark County and against the total. We created CD 1 with a greater portion of the population from outside

Clark County than from inside Clark County. By creating the districts this way, we have a vast differentiation of population centers and the rural counties.

As to the racial and ethnic distribution, we tried to account for previous federal court decisions. We tried to create districts where a minority might have a fighting chance. In our CD 4, the Hispanic community has a greater representation than it does in any other district. We did not try to dilute populations or their influence.

Our plan does not guarantee that anyone gets elected. We all know how much hard work and fund-raising play roles in someone becoming elected. If you do the hard work you do have a better chance. You will also notice we give a greater percentage of population in CD 3, where 13.3 percent of the district is black. Congressional District 1 has the highest Asian total—11.5 percent of the population—so we did not dilute the Asian population. We cannot guarantee, nor should we, that any one minority would win over another, but we did not dilute the population of any ethnicity or racial community. We spent hours on this map to be certain of that.

We want to have unified Congressional districts that can account for future growth. More than that, we want districts that represent all the issues that face the State of Nevada. We did not want to be presumptive and tell the Congressional representatives where their offices should be located, but it is easy to see that in CDs 1 through 3, there could easily be two district offices—one in Clark County and one in the Reno area. In CD 4, we could easily have offices in the population centers of Clark and possibly Elko Counties so our Congressional representatives would understand all the issues.

We did a lot of research and looked at most states. We discovered that South Carolina, which is going from three Congressional districts to four, has always divided the state along traditional regional lines that have monolithic issues, et cetera. For the first time, they came to the conclusion that they have no clout, so they are planning to divide their state so each representative will have an intimate knowledge of all the issues facing their state. Now, when an issue facing the State of South Carolina comes up, the entire Congressional delegation will be unified and knowledgeable about that issue.

You see a little different situation in Louisiana, where the governor is recommending an end to their traditional regionalization that has every Congressional district touch every issue facing Louisiana. He is meeting with a lot of opposition, I might add, but they are moving from seven districts to six.

Chair Segerblom:

As I look at your numbers, does a majority of the population in each of the four districts live in Clark County?

Ed Gobel:

No. In CD 1, a majority live outside Clark County. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciated your comments about redistricting and that attention be paid to every community and that communities not be split so as to water down minority influence.

Chair Segerblom:

Are there any questions for Mr. Gobel? Seeing none, thank you for your effort, Mr. Gobel. Obviously, you spent hours and hours on this issue.

Vicenta Montoya, representing Sí Se Puede Latino Democratic Caucus:

This morning I was looking at all the software, and I want to thank Melissa, who helped me a great deal. I also developed a map ([Exhibit H](#)) that is quite different from the previous one. There has to be recognition that we have an urban core and that the urban core is in southern Nevada. This map was generated by working outward from Shelley Berkley's Congressional district, because there is an interest for incumbents to be able to protect their districts. That is a permissible basis for drawing district lines. This map does preserve all the existing incumbents. Most importantly, it takes into consideration the drawing of a map with respect to the large Hispanic growth that has taken place in our state. Within the last ten years, the engine that generated that growth was the Hispanic population that immigrated to Nevada.

We have talked about areas of interest. The northeast corridor of Las Vegas is an area of interest. It has the highest density of Hispanic, or Latino, population in the state. This is an area that has grown since the 1940s. It expanded from Sunrise Acres in North Las Vegas. This area of interest is connected by language, culture, food, and children going to the same schools. The demographics of economics are similar—working-class families. It is in the best interest of the people living in that area that it not be divided, nor should the power to be represented by people of their choice be diluted.

I am concerned about the construction of the new Fourth Congressional District. I understand that a minority cannot become a majority in a particular district under the Voting Rights Act; however, that high density of the Latino population in the northeast portion of the Las Vegas Valley cannot be ignored and deserves to have representation. I know there are other pockets within the districts that are going to be created that will also show a proportionally higher population of

Latinos, and that the north and south areas of Henderson and Boulder City will have a lesser percentage. The most important thing today is to reinforce that the area of interest for the Latino population is in the northeast. Even if that might not generate a majority minority, it certainly designates an area where there would be a sizeable Latino population for that created Congressional district.

My real concern is for the Assembly districts. The way the Assembly districts are currently configured, we elected six Latinos, which was a significant increase. My concern is that there will be a decrease in the future because the districts that will be represented have an undercount of anywhere from 15 to 20 percent, and many of them are contiguous. I am concerned that there is going to be stacking and dilution. Configuring Assembly districts needs to be taken into consideration so there is not a loss of Latino representation.

Those are my concerns. I understand this is a difficult situation and that there will need to be more deliberation; however, it will be easier because of the software you can use. It will be easier to make those configurations. I am putting a lot of trust in you to do that. As a representative of Sí Se Puede Latino Democratic Caucus, we will continue to consult with you and bring you information we believe to be important concerning the redistricting.

Chair Segerblom:

Are there any questions? For the audience, those maps you create can be saved.

Andrew Murphy, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I applaud and recognize the transparency of this process. It is an excellent thing for our democracy.

I could be here representing the Asian/Pacific Islander segment of Nevada, because unfortunately an earlier speaker got it wrong in saying all the populations that have spoken today have been represented. However, I am not here representing that interest. I am here representing every Nevada voter. What I want to speak to you about is double districting. This is a practice that has been around throughout Nevada's history. People can live in a Senate district that has two Senators. While I love having two of you to lobby and call my friends, I think it violates the basic principle of local representation, which is one person, one vote. Out of fairness to every Nevada voter, one voter should have one Senator.

Robert Henry, Vice President, Filipino American Chamber of Commerce of Greater Nevada:

I am a Filipino American businessman operating in Las Vegas. I moved my family into our home in Las Vegas in 2002. Our Chamber is affiliated with the Federation of Filipino American Chambers of Commerce, which is a nationwide organization of 48 Filipino American chambers located throughout the country.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak today about this important redistricting issue and have three thoughts I would like to express on behalf of the Asian American/Pacific Islander community.

I would like you to know that, as a member of the AAPI community, I am concerned that we have fair and adequate representation through our elected officials. According to the U.S. Census Bureau website and the official State of Nevada website, our community grew in numbers since the 2000 Census by over 100 percent, and I understand this growth may continue. I want to see any of the districts in which the AAPI community has a population concentration be preserved within their current boundaries so as not to split up or dilute our concentration in any of our home districts.

Finally, although I would agree that any diligently elected official should theoretically be able to provide fair representation for our community's issues and concerns, I would still look forward to a time when a fair number of our own AAPI community leaders would actually represent us as elected officials in our government. After all, we are a significant percentage—somewhere around 7 or 8 percent—of the largest county in the state and in the state itself.

Joe Neal, representing the National Association of the Advancement of Colored People:

I am here today on behalf of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), which asked me to speak on this issue since I was part of three reapportionments in the Legislature for over 32 years during which I was a legislator.

On behalf of the NAACP, we are asking that the reapportionment be fair and that you do not dilute the population in order to take care of certain interests. This time, a Congressional seat is being added, and I know a lot of people are jockeying and trying to control that. Here again, we ask you to be fair and make a determination as to what the best interests of the communities and the State of Nevada would be. We have not taken a position on redistricting, but we will be giving information to our representatives as you go through this process.

We hope the Assembly and Senate will determine what the core district is as you begin to redistrict. In the past, the core district for the Senate was District 4, and the core districts for the Assembly were Districts 6 and 7. Once those were drawn, you drew out from them and began to add individuals into those districts. As Assemblywoman Neal pointed out, the district she represents has about 2,000 people over the target population in your redistricting goal for the Assembly. We hope you take a look at that and keep it fair.

I know some have indicated that we have a number of Hispanics and blacks in the Legislature and that this far exceeds our numbers. Speaking from the black point of view, the only person currently in the Legislature who represents a predominantly black population is my daughter, Assemblywoman Neal. The rest of the individuals represent people from all over. We made that possible by electing minorities, which indicates they can serve just as well as anyone else in this state.

I have seen a proposed map for the Congressional districts. I advise you to look at that map very carefully, because I think that map is aimed at diluting some of the minority population within this area to prevent the residents from electing a person to Congress. Make sure that does not happen and that everyone has an equal chance. We know many people can run for office, but only four will be elected to Congress.

As one who has gone through this experience three times, I believe the LCB staff should be commended for doing all the work to provide the public with access to the computer so people can experiment with how they think these districts should be drawn.

Chair Segerblom:

Are there any questions for ex-Senator Neal? [There were none.]

Yvette Williams, Chair, Clark County Black Caucus:

Thank you for this opportunity to speak with you today about this very important issue. We agree with ex-Senator Neal's comments and the position the NAACP has taken. We have been working with staff on mapping precincts to understand the process and be able to make a recommendation. As many of you know, we will be visiting you in Carson City on April 18, and our intent is to hand you our recommendation.

Today, we want to put on record our support and concern about fair representation. We believe the Census underrepresents African Americans.

Many African Americans do not trust the government, and, therefore, do not participate in the Census.

As the speaker from Elko stated earlier about the requirement that all communities of interest get consideration during redistricting, we want to remind the Committee that African Americans participated in the last presidential election in record numbers—95 percent in Clark County and 78 percent statewide.

In looking at the map, we are really interested in Senate Districts 1, 2, and 4 because that is where the major African American population lives. We would like to preserve that population in one district. We will be providing you with a formal recommendation on April 18.

There were previous recommendations we are very concerned with, because we feel we and our community issues will not be represented and that our voice will be diluted. We ask you to consider that even if the numbers look good, it could take away the voices of people who are consistently underrepresented in our government. We still hope to have a seat at the table.

Artie Blanco, Nevada State Director, Mi Familia Vota:

I also want to thank your staff—Felicia and Melissa here in the Las Vegas office—for helping me with the new GIS system.

Mi Familia Vota is a national nonpartisan organization. Our goal is to build a unit of political power through citizenship, voter registration, voter education, voter participation, and civic engagement post-Election Day.

As we all know, Hispanics are the state's second-largest population, representing 46 percent of the state's population growth during the last decade. Many areas form communities of interest, particularly in and around northeast Las Vegas. The primary boundaries would be Interstate 15, Nellis Boulevard, Cheyenne Avenue, and Desert Inn Road. I have a copy of this map ([Exhibit I](#)) I will be presenting later.

We support and encourage the legislative leadership to provide as many opportunities as possible where Latinos can influence the electoral outcome and choose a representative of their choice. That is a key issue.

The year 2010 was a historic election year for Hispanic voters across the State of Nevada. Hispanic legislators went from two Assembly members to

two Senators and six Assembly members, representing 9.5 percent of the total Senate body and 14.3 percent of the Assembly.

We support and encourage the leadership, to the extent possible, to protect the Latinos who were elected in 2010 to the Nevada State Legislature. The Hispanic population represents 26 percent of the state's population. Although 79 percent of the Hispanic population is in Clark County, we are also very proud to have a Latino Assembly member elected from Washoe County.

Mi Familia Vota will be speaking with Latino voters on several issues, including redistricting and how it affects them, their families, and the Hispanic community. We look forward to future hearings during which we can present additional information and opinions directly from Latino voters. We are speaking of first-time Latino voters who had their voices heard in 2010 and want to continue to have their voices heard post-election, which is key for a growing Hispanic population and for continuing to increase their engagement in the process.

Thank you again for having this hearing and allowing us to give public testimony.

Chair Segerblom:

Thank you very much.

Senator Cegavske:

To both Chairs and the Committee staff, we have heard many comments at all our meetings. Could we get a list of recommendations? We have heard new suggestions today, and I am very appreciative of that, but I would like to see the comments written down so that we could refer to them as we make these decisions.

Chair Segerblom:

I know we are having minutes taken of these joint meetings. Perhaps staff can cull through and summarize them.

Howard Watts, representing the Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada:

My thanks to all of you for taking time out of your weekend to hold this hearing for public input on redistricting. I want to discuss a few key issues and concerns we have as you move forward on the redistricting process.

The first and foremost interest we have is in protecting traditionally underrepresented communities—Asian Americans, African Americans, and

Latinos. We also mean communities of interest, which have previously been discussed. Communities of interest are often smaller neighborhoods connected by cultural identity, language, and socioeconomic status. As community members present information about their communities of interest, we ask, based on the size and connection between these different communities, that no packing of minorities or communities of interest, if they are sufficiently large, happens. That way you do not create a small group of districts completely dominated by these underrepresented populations. Also, do not crack them or split these communities so they have no voting power in any district. So, those are our two concerns with diluting the representation and the vote strength of these traditionally underrepresented communities.

Also, we would like to state for the record that we are also in support of ending double-member districts, which we feel are a violation of the one person, one vote principle.

As you know, it will be your job to approve the plans to redistrict the State Board of Education and the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) Board of Regents. Working with the Southern Nevada Diversity Roundtable, which includes a group of stakeholders interested in minority representation and participation in higher education, we met with the NSHE Chief Executive Officer and look forward to providing community input as he works on their maps. We encourage you to be very diligent in looking at these maps, making sure that the communities that are expressing interest in the redistricting process are heard. Also, when you are looking at those plans, do not just rubberstamp what has been presented by those bodies to you, because transparency is a major issue.

Thank you for your time and for accepting public comment. We will be continuing to work with the community to solicit testimony about communities of interest, and we hope you are receptive and include and incorporate that testimony as it comes in while you are working on the map-drawing process.

Finally, as a grassroots organization, the Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada (PLAN) will be reaching out to community members, asking them to continue to supply you with the information you need to make informed decisions while you are drawing these district lines. We will be bringing people to this building to show them how the mapmaking software you have provided works.

We do a Nevada Racial Equity Report Card each legislative session, and we will be including a special section in that Report Card on redistricting and its impacts on racial equity.

John Lacenere, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I urge this body to adhere strictly to the one person, one vote rule of law. It is the bedrock principle upon which our representative democracy is founded. We were founded on the principle that all men are created equal. What that really means is that all votes are created equal. I hope that when I vote next time, my vote carries as much weight as does someone's vote from rural Nevada.

I live in southern Nevada, and Yucca Mountain is a very serious concern for me. I found that most of the support for Yucca Mountain comes from our friends to the north. I hope that all Committee members here, regardless of whether you are a Republican or a Democrat, make certain that southern Nevada's concerns are fully represented with this redistricting.

Annette Teijeiro, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I have lived here with my family for over 35 years, so I have seen what has happened with redistricting. I am very happy to see that there are Hispanics in our Legislature. I am a first-generation-born American, but my parents are both Hispanic. With that in mind, I am an American first, but there are three things I am worried about. First, I want to see this new redistricting prevent some of the splitting that has occurred in the past. Second, I really want to promote more unity. I have personally observed the divisions between the north and the south of our state, and would like to see Nevada be more cohesive. Third, I really want to protect the equal vote—one person, one vote—which is not occurring right now in Nevada. Examples of this are communities like the City of Mesquite and Indian Springs. The interests of these communities have been split by dividing them among different districts. By doing so, we limit their ability to have continuity. We make it harder for them when counties, cities, and townships are split. We make it difficult for the people who live in those communities to be represented.

We need to promote unity. When we divide the northern part of the state from the southern part of the state, we are doing a disservice to our state in being able to represent a federal view. We need to be a united Nevada; therefore, I would like to promote Congressional districts that have proportions containing high-population areas as well as rural populations that work together. All four Congressional districts should have representatives who can represent people from the largest populated county—Clark County—so that they understand the north and the south. Dividing those areas of interest, so we do not have representatives representing all of these factions, would divide Nevada. Dividing Nevada dilutes our ability to accomplish things on a federal level.

Concerning the protection of the equal votes, Assembly District 28 has over 44,000 people, whereas Assembly District 13 has 256,000 people. Just from a mathematical point of view, if 65,000 people is the magic number, what you are saying to the people in the district containing 256,000 people is that their vote is worth only one-fourth, because all those people have only one representative. So in planning redistricting, do so using "future eyes" so that ten years from now we do not have to repeat this process.

Dwayne Chesnut, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I have worked with two other people, Forrest Darby and Mike Selvage, on a grassroots plan for the Congressional districts. We are acting as individuals who are citizens of Nevada. We are interested in being involved in this process. The more I have been involved in this process, the more I am reminded of something Albert Einstein said involving physics, but it applies equally well to redistricting: It should be as simple as possible, but no simpler.

You should have received a detailed description of our plan ([Exhibit J](#)), which we have been working on since November. I do want to thank everyone for making this opportunity available to Clark County. I also want to thank Brian Davie and Kathy Steinle and the other people in the LCB. They have been extremely helpful.

We have heard a lot of talk about the north versus the south, but the problem is the way our population is distributed. We have an enormous area with a relatively small number of people, and an enormous concentration of people in Clark County. As you know, around 71 percent of the total population of the state is in Clark County.

By now, everyone knows the number 675,138—the ideal number of people who would be in a Congressional district if we split the population evenly. When you look at Clark County, you can fit two complete Congressional districts into it and have about 600,000 people left over. If you choose that option, you need to go outside Clark County for about another 75,000 people. There are a million ways you could split this pie up and you could probably spend the next ten years doing that.

We wanted to have reasonable boundaries: highways, interstates, county lines, et cetera, to stop going down individual cul-de-sacs to pick up another five people to satisfy some agenda. The option I am presenting here is one of three we have proposed. We call it option 2, and it basically includes all of Lincoln, Nye, Mineral, and Esmeralda Counties, plus small portions of Douglas and Lyon Counties.

As far as the major part of the redistricting for Congressional districts in Clark County is concerned, look at the intersection of Las Vegas Boulevard and U.S. Highway 95 as a pivot point. To stay with nice, straight lines, we found that one of the natural boundaries you run into is Charleston Boulevard, so this district swings east to Charleston, goes northeast and then south to the Arizona border, back up along the California border, hits Interstate 15, and returns to the point of origin. That creates a fairly clean Congressional district.

There has been much discussion behind the scenes concerned with how close to equal is equal. It generates a lot of heat in some ways, because some people want strict equality while other people feel there should be a little bit more flexibility to satisfy community-of-interest needs. Our group has done a considerable amount of legal research on the subject, and the controlling law seems to be *Abrams v. Johnson* 521 U.S. 74 (1997), which allowed at least a 0.35 percent deviation between the largest and smallest Congressional districts in a state. If you look at our plan, the largest deviation is 0.24 percent—which is well within the constraints of *Abrams*.

To get some historical perspective, we looked at the districts for the 108th Congress, based on the 2000 Census. Arkansas had a 1 percent deviation between maximum and minimum. As you look into that, it is because they followed a major river, the Arkansas River, as one of their Congressional boundaries. Three lawsuits were filed in Pennsylvania, which had only a 0.31 percent deviation. It was ultimately resolved at the Supreme Court level, and Pennsylvania's redistricting was upheld. So, we have some examples where deviations were bigger than what we are proposing.

We are starting out with essentially equal population, but how many people are eligible to vote? That is where differences begin to show. Statewide, about 75.4 percent of the total population is voting age. In our proposed CD 4, only 70.5 percent of the population is voting age, which is a large difference. In our proposed CD 2 in the northern part of the state, the voting age population is 76.2 percent. Looking further at how many of these eligible people actually bother to register, you begin to see even bigger differences. In CD 4, only 37.7 percent of the total population is actually registered to vote. In the north in CD 2, the number is 51 percent. When you look at how many people actually voted, as a percentage of the total population, you find a low of 22 percent in our proposed CD 4 and a high of 33.9 percent in our proposed CD 2.

What does this mean in terms of communities of interest? We can define that community, but it is going to be up to the people in that community to take

advantage of the opportunity and register to vote, or bother to vote if they are registered. That is the big challenge for all of us interested in making sure we get as close as we can to one vote for every person.

Looking at the adult population demographics, you see some striking differences. In our proposed CD 2, over 80 percent are Caucasian with very small numbers of African Americans and Asian Americans. The proposed CD 4 has by far the largest Hispanic component, plus a large African American component, so this proposal gives you a pretty solid minority representation for that Congressional district.

Looking at the partisan makeup of our proposal, because the Democrats have the majority of registration in the state, we chose to represent the differences as Democrats minus Republicans. If you look at the registration numbers, Democratic registration has a 7.31 percentage point edge over Republican registration in CD 1. In CD 2, the Republicans have an almost 8 percentage point edge over the Democrats. The way we have drawn CD 3 gives Democrats a 10 percentage point edge, and in CD 4, the Democrats have an 18 percentage point edge. That looks pretty good for the Democrats, but looking at the voter turnout, the difference in CD 1 drops to 2.85 percentage points. In CD 2, the Republican edge increases to 13.84 percentage points; CD 3 drops to 5.35 percentage points, and CD 4 drops to 12.8 percentage points. These are the numbers you should keep in mind when you are looking at the political impact of any of these redistricting plans—how do they affect things, and what challenges does it present for the different parties.

Everyone is interested in whether or not these districts are competitive. Some of us would like for them not to be, if we happen to be very partisan, and some of us would like them to be more competitive. Looking at the 2010 election for Governor, and in just Clark County, in our proposed CD 1 and CD 3, Governor Sandoval, a Republican, got more votes than Rory Reid, a Democrat. He polled a little bit more than 50 percent in both those proposed districts. In the Clark County portion of CD 4, Reid won by a little more than 10 percentage points. The party results were the same in the Lieutenant Governor's race.

Again, we can look at these districts in a number of different ways, but politically, CD 1 and CD 3 are pretty competitive with a slight Democratic edge on voter turnout. Congressional District 4 and CD 2 are fairly equally balanced when it comes to which party has an edge.

To summarize, we used major features for the Congressional district boundaries as we tried to stay away from gerrymandering. One thing I did not mention is

that we believe we should try to be as compact as possible, and we tried to keep that in mind as we went through this process. We have population totals that are well within the *Abrams* constraints, and we believe this is a realistic division of voters by geography, demographics, and party. It keeps everything compact, it does not particularly favor one group or another on a statewide basis, and we wind up with two out of the four districts being very competitive as well as one heavily Republican and one heavily Democratic.

I appreciate this opportunity to show you our plan. Our next move is to work on State Senate and Assembly districts.

Chair Segerblom:

Thank you and your team so much. I know you really have spent lots of time on this, and it has been very informative. Are there any questions? Seeing none, we will move to our next speaker.

Kenneth King, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I would like to thank you for taking on this huge task. Clark County contains a large number of what appear to be "snake" districts for both the Assembly and the Senate. Nearly all the districts do not seem to follow any geographical community of interest boundaries or Voting Rights Act requirements. In fact, the only district that appears to be compact is Assembly District 15. Because this Census will require a major redistricting of the districts, can we try to avoid the gerrymandering that took place ten years ago? It might be best to start redistricting in Clark County with a zero ground, as was demonstrated earlier today. As we saw, when we start moving populations around, one district is going to eat up large parts of another district in some areas, such as the center of Las Vegas.

Kenneth Rowley, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

It is a pleasure to have the Joint Committees here in Las Vegas to talk with us. I have noticed one thing during the three sessions I have been able to view or attend, and that is that we are reasonably good at coming up with plans for the Congressional districts, but no one has come up with a state legislative layout, and that is because we are waiting for you. There have been rumors that the two parties have decided they wish to stay with the same number of Senate and Assembly districts, but those are nothing more than rumors. Those of us who would like to try drawing those maps cannot start on that issue until you let us know whether there will be more representatives, the same number of representatives, or fewer representatives in our Legislature. That hampers us, and the longer we are hampered, the shorter the time for people who are interested in this process to come up with viable maps. Your help on that issue

would be greatly appreciated, because we need that information before we can start laying out maps.

Some friends of mine from Mesquite were not able to be here, but the Mayor sent a letter ([Exhibit K](#)). For the past ten years, Mesquite has been split between Congressional Districts 2 and 3. The representatives of Mesquite are unhappy with that, and so are their two Congressmen. The feeling among those I have talked to in Mesquite is that they would love to be incorporated fully into Congressional District 2.

I would also like to mention Indian Springs ([Exhibit L](#)). People there did not vote because they did not know they could. The town of Indian Springs was split down the middle. Half was in a mail ballot-only precinct, and when those people showed up at the polling place across the road, they could not vote. They were disenfranchised because the town was split. That should be an easy issue to rectify.

Daniel Braisted, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I represent Nevadans. From the looks of the handouts and presentations, many people have spent a lot of intelligent time working on this issue. Basic leadership 101 teaches "where performance is measured, performance improves." Many of the handouts speak about race, gender, political party, and ethnicity. Yes, they are important, yet when will people in America and in Nevada decide that their loyalty is as Nevadans in America?

My major criteria for redistricting the State Assembly, State Senate, U.S. Congress, and U.S. Senate would include the same numbers but would be done by zip code. You in the press have spent a great deal of time in the last months talking about money, taxes, education, crime, health care, et cetera. The easiest and least expensive way to correct these ills using zero money is with mild competition. All of you have read Dale Carnegie's *How to Win Friends and Influence People*. Back in 1936, he related a story about Charles Schwab, the steel magnate, who walked into a plant that was low on production numbers. He listened to all the excuses, and then he picked up a piece of chalk and asked how many ingots they had produced. They said, "Six." He took his chalk and wrote the number 6 on the floor. When the swing shift came in, they asked what the "6" written on the floor meant. Someone answered, "Well, the boss was here, and that was the number of ingots produced by the day crew." At the end of the swing shift, there was a "7" on the floor. By the time the graveyard crew finished, there was a "10" written on the floor. The whole point is, there was mild competition. What we need to do among legislators is set up a mild competition and measure the performance of

our representatives. Some of you, ladies and gentlemen, may not like that, but the representatives who are leaders will say, "Yes, bring it on. I want to prove I am one of the better leaders." When we can prove that leaders are better, we will not have to spend so much money on campaign issues. We can easily pull up a chart and it would say "before" and "after." How many Eagle Scouts did you produce in your district? How many patents did you apply for? How many high school graduates? How many dropouts? What are the health and welfare costs for your district? What are the gross sales for your district, and did they go up or down? What is the employment? What are the SAT scores? When information about specific individual districts is available, things will change at minimal cost.

In summary, where performance is measured, performance improves at a minimal cost via mild competition. Redistricting by jagged lines makes it harder to track performance. Redistricting by zip codes and not influenced by race, ethnicity, political background, and gender, is the least expensive way to improve statistics for the state, which is why we are here and why you are spending your time here on your Saturday. Good performance is based on performance and not on race, not on ethnicity, not on politics, and not on gender.

Because the vast majority of data can easily and readily be associated with a zip code, make redistricting by zip code to facilitate tracking and performance your priority.

Assemblyman Anderson:

About 95 percent of my district is in zip code 89121, so I do agree that this is a good idea to the extent that it would be possible.

Daniel Braisted:

Even if you had to split a zip code area up, it would be a whole lot easier for everyone to be held accountable.

Andres Ramirez, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I was privileged to be part of the redistricting process in 2001. I am happy to see the staff at the LCB is still here and still doing a great job. What is remarkable is that, except for Senator Parks, who was an Assemblyman, every one of the members of this Joint Committee is new. You were elected from the districts that were drawn in 2001.

When we look at what Nevada has gone through over the last ten years, this growth in population contains an incredible diversity—not just in geography and

ethnicity but in age, gender, and a number of other factors that are measured by the Census. We have an incredibly diverse and integrated state. In fact, the Clark County urban area is one of the most integrated urban areas in the entire country.

Looking at what constitutes a community of interest or what constitutes representation, I think it is phenomenal that our community has elected representatives from a wide spectrum of constituency groups in areas that are not necessarily always dominated by that constituency group.

Having said that, there are areas of historical and current importance to these communities such as west Las Vegas, which is historically important to the black community. Areas such as the eastern area, or east Las Vegas and the northeast, have clusters predominantly of Hispanics located in them. There are a variety of ways to separate the boundaries—whether we use the interstates or zip codes, precinct boundaries or Census blocks. In fact, all the data is available split by all those boundaries now, so whether we split them by zip code, precinct, or block we will have all the data available to us.

When looking at redistricting, look at what makes the most sense and will protect the variety of communities we have. Today, we have heard representatives from the African American community, from the women's community, from the Asian American/Pacific Islander community, and we have heard representatives from the Hispanic community. It is possible for us to protect and even enhance the diversity we have in Nevada and to continue to elect leaders who represent our community. I would encourage you to take the variety of comments you have heard here today into account as a whole and not isolate them individually.

We in the Hispanic community consider the boundaries for a community of interest to be the Interstate 15 (I-15) corridor on the west, Nellis Boulevard on the east, Cheyenne Avenue on the north, and Sahara Avenue on the south. If you look at the geography within that area, that is a cohesive unit with high concentrations of Hispanics. Regardless of how you draw your congressional districts, that is the block we would like to see protected in terms of protecting a community of interest for Hispanics.

Leonard Marciano, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I would like to thank the Chair and this Committee for allowing me to speak today about unifying the legislative districts of North Las Vegas. As a result of decisions made during Nevada's 2000 redistricting, the City of North Las Vegas has fragmented representation with an inherent conflict of interest built into the

legislative districts that represent it. Now is the time to eliminate the flaws of 2000. Since 2000, North Las Vegas has become the fourth-largest city in Nevada. Its population has grown by 87.9 percent during the last ten years. By contrast, Henderson grew by 47 percent, Reno grew by 24.8 percent, and Las Vegas grew by 22 percent.

Today, five members of the Nevada State Legislature represent North Las Vegas as well as Las Vegas. The districts they represent include Assembly Districts 1 and 17 and Senate Districts 1, 4, and 2. As an example, Senate District 4 runs from Lone Mountain Road in North Las Vegas to Bonneville Avenue in Las Vegas. No one is pointing fingers at the legislators involved; they are just playing the hand dealt them in 2000. The obvious conflict of interest is especially painful for North Las Vegas when monies are distributed to the cities of Nevada from taxes collected under an antiquated formula started in 1989 that penalizes North Las Vegas. Therefore, North Las Vegas needs a member of the Assembly and a member of the Senate whose base constituents are the families of North Las Vegas and who act as advocates for their vital interests. It is time to end fragmented representation with its inherent conflict of interest.

Rosemary Flores, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I was born and raised in Reno, but have lived in southern Nevada for several years now. I am here to ask for fairness, for one person, one vote, and I am asking you to avoid dilution and gerrymandering. Most of my work is done in the Hispanic community. I travel approximately 20 to 30 miles every day working in the north and east Las Vegas communities. As we become educated, many times we move outside our communities but continue to work for the benefits of immigrants and new individuals moving into our communities. Basically, we want to ensure representation of the communities and neighborhoods, because they have fairly collective interests and share many similarities. Right now, we see that our youngsters and parents really need representation. They feel so comfortable right now being able to communicate by phone or in person at any time with their representatives.

As volunteers, my colleagues and I are assisting some parents in learning more about redistricting. We are also encouraging them to be part of mapping their communities. We ask that you be respectful, fair, and listen to the true concerns of the people who live in the various communities.

Devon Brooks, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I want to say thank you. I understand that the position you are in is extremely important, but can really be difficult. For the record, I want to state that to the

black community, west Las Vegas is extremely important. There are a large number of African Americans who live in North Las Vegas as well, and I just hope you take that into consideration when you do your redistricting.

A lot of us do not really understand the redistricting process nor do we understand how the money is going to be distributed. I guess that is our responsibility as constituents in the community, but if we had more knowledge about the redistricting process, that would help a lot of people as well.

Again, I want to say thank you and remind you that the decisions you are going to have to make will influence the next ten years. Please take everything you have heard today into consideration.

Assemblywoman Flores:

Thank you for coming here today. It is obviously very important for the youth to be engaged in this, so it is very nice to see you out here on a Saturday giving your time as well as being interested in this process.

Chair Segerblom:

Is there anyone in Carson City or Elko who wants to testify?

Ralph Sacrison, Private Citizen, Elko, Nevada:

I strongly endorse the statement Matt McCarty made earlier.

Sylvia Lazos, Cochair, Southern Nevada Diversity Roundtable; Professor of Law, William S. Boyd School of Law, University of Nevada, Las Vegas:

I thank you for your service and for taking on such a hard task. I represent the Southern Nevada Diversity Roundtable, a coalition of groups having the common purpose of promoting diversity in southern Nevada. We want public institutions to be more responsive to the working class and to the racial- minority-group needs we have in southern Nevada. We are working hard for that purpose.

As you heard, one of the key principles of redistricting is to respect communities of interest—neighborhoods that are cohesive, have similar interests, and deserve to have a voice in the democratic process. In the redistricting process, it is important that our Legislature respect these communities of interest. I think this is particularly the case for Latino communities. In Clark County, as recently reported in the 2010 Census, almost 1 in 3 people are Latino. In our Clark County School District (CCSD) public education system, when looking at children under ten, 1 in 2 is Latino. As you have heard, in Clark County, the highest concentrations of Latinos are in the

corridor bounded by I-15, Nellis Boulevard, Cheyenne Avenue, and either Sahara Avenue or Desert Inn Road ([Exhibit M](#)). We endorse the plan Artie Blanco of Mi Familia Vota has presented as well as that of Sí Se Puede Latino Democratic Caucus. They may not be consistent, but they have the same idea concerning not cracking or dicing this important community.

If you look at the demographic data from the American Community Survey (ACS) of the U.S. Census Bureau, these families are generally low-income—below \$25,000. When I graduated from law school, I made \$30,000. That was several decades ago, but it was very tough to make it on \$30,000, so I do not know how families make it on \$25,000, but that is about the average income in that particular area. The housing stock is older, the housing prices are lower, and there are a lot of rental homes and apartments available in the area. These are working-class families who depend on public services to help them raise their families. They depend on public services so they do not fall into bankruptcy or homelessness. These communities need higher education in Nevada to remain affordable. The proposals before the Board of Regents would almost double tuition. These are communities that deserve a voice in preserving access to education for them, their children, and for Nevadans. That should be the number-one priority of our higher education system.

In these communities, according to ACS data, at least 1 in 4 families is what the census calls "language isolated," which means that one or two parents in a family speak primarily Spanish at home. So in this area we potentially have a high population of children who need strong support in the public education system for adequate English language learner (ELL) services. From research, we know it takes between five and seven years to really become fluent in the language. I do not mean being able to go to a grocery store or interact in a commercial transaction, but to really understand the language. What we need in public education in Nevada is to have a system that really helps these children become assimilated and integrated into Nevada. Our future depends on that. Recall that I reported to you that 1 in 2 children in CCSD under the age of ten is Latino. I am not saying they are all ELL, but about half are, and if we do not do a good job with them, our future will not be a rosy one.

It is a myth that immigrants, particularly Latino immigrants, do not want to learn English. In 2004, I conducted a survey of Latino immigrants in this particular enclave I am talking about. Many immigrants identified English as being a barrier to their economic betterment. About 80 percent said that they wished they could speak better English because they believed they could "do better for my family." I think it is a responsibility of all our public institutions to do a

better job helping these people who have settled here do better for themselves, their families, and for Nevada.

These communities see education as an avenue for success. On the average, the adults in these communities do not have the same level of education that we do elsewhere in CCSD. Most have just barely a high school education; however, they understand that they want something better for their children. These families deserve policies in Nevada that raise Nevada from dead last in chances that a child will be able to succeed, according to the Education Reform Blue Ribbon Task Force's report on Nevada education reform.

As Howard Watts of PLAN reported to you, our organization and PLAN are working with NSHE to put together maps that will better represent these communities. We also believe that in the Assembly and Senate redistricting process we should be thinking about how to preserve this community so that the important interests I just detailed to you are represented adequately in our legislative process. This is a tough process that is about compromise, but it is a process in which every voice deserves to be heard.

Chair Segerblom:

This is your last chance. Does anyone else in the audience want to make a public comment? [There was no response.] Does anyone on the Committee?

Assemblyman Hardy:

As was previously stated, there is a letter from the Mayor of Mesquite ([Exhibit K](#)). It is on NELIS, and I just want to make certain it is part of the public record and on file.

Chair Segerblom:

We have it.

Senator Cegavske:

It is always a pleasure to see Senator Neal, who is someone we can call on. As he stated, he has been through three redistricting marathons, so I appreciate you being here today. It was great to see you, and I am sure we will be calling you, asking for your opinions. I also want to say how impressed I was with the people who were here today and with their ideas and suggestions.

Daniel Braisted:

A lot of the communities want to stay together and be groups, yet the principles for success are based on the people you associate with and the books you read. Unfortunately, a lot of unemployed people are spending time with other

unemployed people, and a lot of ethnic groups are spending time among themselves. It might be something to consider that we could help the state by splitting these groups up so they can learn other ideas.

Chair Segerblom:

I do not see anyone else who wants to speak, so thank you very much for coming. I think we have learned a lot. Las Vegas and Clark County are certainly very interested in this process, which is fantastic. We will take your comments into consideration. We are adjourned [at 12:32 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: April 2, 2011

Time of Meeting: 10:01 a.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
	C	Michael J. Stewart	PowerPoint
	D	Maria Chairez	Letter, Petition, and Map
	E	Matt McCarty	Letter
	F	Linda West Myers	Redistricting Plan
	G	Linda West Myers	Map
	H	Vicenta Montoya	Map
	I	Artie Blanco	Map
	J	Dwayne Chesnut	Redistricting Proposal and Maps
	K	Kenneth Rowley	Letter from the Mayor of Mesquite
	L	Kenneth Rowley	Letter from the Chair of the Indian Springs Town Advisory Board
	M	Sylvia Lazos	Maps