



NEVADA LEGISLATURE

SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC HEARING BY SPECIAL MASTERS TO RECEIVE TESTIMONY CONCERNING REDISTRICTING OF LEGISLATIVE AND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS

The first of two Public Hearings by Special Masters to Receive Testimony Concerning Redistricting of Legislative and Congressional Districts was held on Monday, October 10, 2011, at 9:30 a.m. in Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. A copy of this set of “Summary Minutes of the Public Hearing” including the “Meeting Notice and Agenda” ([Exhibit A](#)) and other substantive exhibits are on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB), Carson City, Nevada. You may contact the Research Library online at <http://www.leg.state.nv.us/lcb/research/library/feedbackmail.cfm>; or telephone: 775/684-6827. An audio record may be purchased through the LCB’s Publications Office (e-mail: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775/684-6835).

SPECIAL MASTERS PRESENT:

Thomas R. Sheets, Esquire, Chair
Robert E. Erickson
Alan Glover, Carson City Clerk-Recorder

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU STAFF PRESENT (CARSON CITY):

Brian L. Davie, Legislative Services Officer, Administrative Division
Tracey L. Wineglass, Senior Research Secretary, Research Division

CALL TO ORDER AND OPENING REMARKS

- Thomas R. Sheets, Esquire, Chair, and a partner with McDonald Carano Wilson LLP, Las Vegas, opened the hearing and introduced the Special Masters. He explained that Judge James Todd Russell, First Judicial District Court, Carson City and Storey County, invoked Rule 53 (“Masters”) of the *Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure* to consider Case No. 11-OC-00042-1B. Chair Sheets noted that the hearings are in compliance with the State’s Open Meeting Law.

He provided background on the redistricting process and how it relates to the *Nevada Constitution* and the United States Census Bureau. Chair Sheets explained that litigation had ensued after Governor Brian Sandoval’s veto of the redistricting legislation that was passed in the 2011 Nevada State Legislature. He provided a history of the litigation process and read the Nevada Supreme Court’s decision regarding the appointment of the Special Masters.

- Alan Glover, Special Master, and Carson City Clerk-Recorder, provided his academic background and professional history. He shared his legislative background related to redistricting issues.
- Robert E. Erickson, Special Master, and former director of the LCB Research Division, outlined his education and professional background, work history, and experience with redistricting projects for the Nevada Legislature.
- Chair Sheets provided his personal and professional history. He disclosed that McDonald Carano Wilson LLP employed Nevada State Senator Ben Kieckhefer and stated that there will be no contact with the firm or its Director of Communications, Senator Kieckhefer, during this process. He outlined the duties of the Special Masters and explained that their goal would be to contribute to the State’s electoral process in an equitable and professional manner.

OUTLINE OF PROPOSED SCHEDULE AND PROCESS TO BE USED BY SPECIAL MASTERS

- Chair Sheets outlined the schedule and process to be used by the parties. He asked that they use their time efficiently to address issues. Chair Sheets noted the time limit for public comment would be determined by the number of individuals who wanted to testify.

PRESENTATION OF ARGUMENTS AND EVIDENCE BY PARTIES TO LITIGATION

- Chair Sheets asked the litigants in Case No. 11-OC-00042-1B to identify themselves and the parties they represented.
 - Mark A. Hutchison, Esquire, Hutchison & Steffen, Las Vegas, representing the Nevada Republican Party; Ken King, private citizen; Sancy King, private citizen; and Allen Rosoff, private citizen.
 - K. Kevin Benson, Deputy Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General, on behalf of Ross Miller, Secretary of State, State of Nevada.
 - Daniel H. Stewart, Esquire, Koch & Scow LLC, Las Vegas, representing Alex Garza, private citizen.
 - Kevin J. Hamilton, Esquire, Perkins Coie LLP, Seattle, Washington, representing Dora J. Guy, private citizen; Leonel Murrieta-Serna, private citizen; Edith Lou Byrd, private citizen; and Samantha Steelman, private citizen.
 - Bradley S. Schrage, Esquire, Jones Vargas, Las Vegas, co-counsel to Kevin J. Hamilton.
 - Denise Pifer, Esquire, Family Law Group, LLC, Las Vegas, representing the League of Women Voters of Las Vegas Valley.
- Chair Sheets clarified that the League of Women Voters of Las Vegas Valley is a party to the lawsuit and directed the presenters to begin.
- K. Kevin Benson, previously identified, explained the process regarding compensation to the Special Masters for their duties. He requested each special master to keep complete records of the time and expenses incurred.

Responding to Mr. Benson regarding the Special Masters' compensation process, Chair Sheets stated that an accurate log will be kept and reported accordingly.

- Mr. Benson continued his discussion focusing on the topic of “nesting.” He stated that the Office of the Secretary of State encouraged this position and that it is not necessary to have 100 percent nesting in order to have a favorable impact.
- Denise Pifer, previously identified, testified that the League of Women Voters of Las Vegas Valley is a nonpartisan group and referred to the briefing submitted to the courts on September 16, 2011, titled “[Proposed] Directives of the Court to the Redistricting Special Masters Panel Regarding Legal Issues” ([Exhibit B](#)). She mentioned that the directive identifies five topics that should be considered

by the Special Masters: (1) population requirements; (2) redistricting criteria; (3) starting points; (4) representational fairness; and (5) majority-minority districts. Ms. Pifer stated that the League prefers that congressional districts be decided before other redistricting issues and referred to the maps regarding the second and third public proposals posted on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System website. She noted that the League does not agree with Judge Russell's orders regarding population differentials and discussed larger population districts and the need for contiguous districts. Ms. Pifer asked that the Special Masters consider the opinion of the League.

- Kevin J. Hamilton, previously identified, referred to Case No. 11-OC-00042-1B, dated September 21, 2011, transmitted from Judge James Todd Russell, First Judicial District Court of Nevada, Carson City and Storey County, that references the court's findings of August 3 and 4, 2011, regarding the identification and task of the Special Masters. He shared the three findings set forth in the court order regarding redistricting:
 1. Special Masters;
 2. Legal Issues; and
 3. Special Master Proceedings and Directives.

Mr. Hamilton reviewed the five directives in which the court ordered the parties to submit briefings under consideration ([Exhibit C](#)):

1. Population requirements;
2. Criteria to be considered;
3. Starting map;
4. Voting Rights Act (VRA) requirement; and
5. Representative fairness for both the U.S. Congressional Districts and the Nevada State Legislative Districts.

He highlighted additional criteria for the Special Masters to consider and shared specifics regarding drawing majority-minority congressional districts. Mr. Hamilton referenced the U.S. Supreme Court case *Thornburg v. Gingles*, which prohibits illegal discriminatory voting practices and explained that three preconditions should be considered by the Special Masters: (1) whether any minority group is sufficiently large and geographically compact enough to constitute a majority in a single-member district; (2) whether that minority group is politically cohesive; and (3) whether block voting by the white majority in Nevada usually defeats the minority's preferred candidate. He compared voting rights preconditions with findings examined by Thomas L. Brunell, Ph.D., Professor of Political Science, Senior Associate Dean, School of Economic Political and Policy Sciences, University of Texas at Dallas, an expert witness for the Republican Party, regarding racial block voting and opined that Dr. Brunell's findings do not sufficiently address the questions defined in the court order.

- Stephen Ansolabehere, Ph.D., Professor of Government in the Department of Government at Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, outlined his background and work experience ([Exhibit D](#)). He stated that the following two questions should be considered by the Special Masters:
 1. Is there evidence for a claim under Section 2 of the VRA? and
 2. How do considerations such as partisan fairness, compactness, and geography matter in the construction of districts in this State?

Discussion ensued between Mr. Hamilton and Dr. Ansolabehere regarding his conclusions with respect to the three preconditions to be considered by the Special Masters, and if there is evidence for a claim under the VRA. Dr. Ansolabehere affirmed, noting that preconditions for the State are not satisfied in the VRA.

In response to Mr. Hamilton, Dr. Ansolabehere stated that the consideration of partisan fairness is controversial because the techniques that have been developed to gauge effectiveness do not consistently derive the same outcome. He referenced two reports (see [Exhibit D-1](#), [Exhibit D-2](#), [Exhibit D-3](#), and [Exhibit D-4](#)) that discuss the mathematical calculations required to construct districts. Dr. Ansolabehere shared that compactness is a useful guide when determining if there is a violation to the VRA, and concluded that some maps, when analyzed, could infer racial line gerrymandering. He emphasized that the complex geography of northern Nevada will be problematic due to population divisions made by mountains and basins in which candidates would represent empty space. Dr. Ansolabehere further explained that issues with compactness and population distribution due to geography would be easier to address in the Las Vegas area due to simple geography. In conclusion, he asked the Special Masters to consider weighing compactness and population distribution within a geographical district.

Discussion ensued between Special Master Erickson and Dr. Ansolabehere regarding clarification of Clark County contiguous districts. Dr. Ansolabehere commented that Clark County has a sufficient Hispanic population that could allow for the Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) as a guideline to draw precincts. He noted that the report ([Exhibit D-4](#)) is focused on capacity but does not address contiguity.

- Mr. Hamilton introduced Bradley S. Schrager, previously identified, who offered suggestions to the Special Masters regarding the starting point for determining the southern Nevada redistricting maps. He emphasized a “neutral policy” plan that preserves communities of interest, adheres to population equality, and nests legislative districts within one another. Mr. Schrager discussed the characteristics that communities of interest share beginning with physical geography, neighborhoods, schools, and highways, and further explained that people within a community of interest can share culture, language, and possibly country of origin. He described some of the current communities of interest contained in S. B. 497 (e.g., the historical

African American, Asian, historical Hispanic, Sun City Anthem retirement, and Old Henderson communities) and asked that the Special Masters consider them based on the existing boundaries.

Continuing, Mr. Schragger discussed the topic of political subdivisions and the effects on the redistricting process and shared examples regarding the cities of Mesquite and North Las Vegas. He described the benefits to State and local officials and their constituents to encourage more effective representation and positive policy outcomes.

Next, Mr. Schragger noted the advantages to nesting and explained the positive aspects that have been raised, both election and administrative, including: (1) saving taxpayer revenue; (2) ensuring better continuity in governance and representation to communicate with other elected officials; and (3) allowing neighbors greater ability to organize and communicate with elected officials and creating manageable and efficient relationships between elected officials and their constituents. He urged the Special Masters to review and accept the benefits of this neutral policy plan.

In conclusion, Mr. Schragger explained that the starting point for drawing the maps should consist of the proposed maps in S.B. 497 and shared potential improvements in Congressional Districts 3 and 4; and preserving both the African American and Hispanic communities into two separate congressional districts. (Please see [Exhibit E](#), [Exhibit E-1](#), [Exhibit E-2](#), [Exhibit E-3](#), [Exhibit E-4](#), [Exhibit E-5](#), and [Exhibit E-6](#).)

Discussion ensued among the Special Masters and Mr. Schragger regarding the maps presented. Mr. Schragger explained that Map G ([Exhibit E-6](#)) would suggest the division of Lincoln and Nye Counties, and either White Pine County or part of Lyon County could be included in the Clark County district. He noted that Nye and Lincoln are more economically and geographically aligned with Clark County than other northern rural counties. Mr. Schragger stated that residents either commute to Clark County or travel for work or personal reasons. Additionally, he commented that White Pine County shares some economic similarities to Clark and Lincoln Counties including the containment of energy transmission lines and other factors that may provide a certain governmental relationship.

- Chair Sheets introduced a letter sent via electronic mail from Ann Brauer, private citizen, on behalf of the Indian Springs Town Advisory Board, to the Special Masters, regarding the district lines affecting her community. (Please see [Exhibit F](#).)
- Mark A. Hutchinson, previously identified, representing the Republican Party, stated that the maps that have previously been suggested by the representatives of the Democratic Party are not representative of traditional districting principles. He noted that Ron Steslow, previously identified, has translated the Republican Party plan into traditional districting principles and CVAP information maps.

- Ron Steslow, previously identified, stated he attended the National Conference of State Legislatures' seminar in Washington, D.C., redistricting principles and law, and received training from the Caliper Corporation on the Maptitude Mapping Software. He explained the process he used in preparing and collecting data and the application of the data into maps utilizing traditional districting principles. Mr. Steslow presented a Microsoft PowerPoint presentation and explained that when preparing the maps he focused on preserving communities of interest, population numbers and total population, voting age population (VAP) and CVAP, voter registration, and representational fairness. He identified each map and its content:

1. Asian population;
2. Hispanic population;
3. African American population;
4. Democrat Congressional Plan, Senate Bill 497;
5. Democrat Proposal, Assembly Bill 533; and
6. Republican Congressional District Proposal.

He pointed out that on his maps, the light blue represents census blocks where the population is less than 35 percent, the red represents census blocks greater than 35 percent, and the white represents census blocks equal to no population. (Please see [Exhibit G](#), [Exhibit G-1](#), [Exhibit G-2](#), [Exhibit G-3](#), [Exhibit G-4](#), [Exhibit G-5](#), [Exhibit G-6](#), [Exhibit G-7](#), [Exhibit G-8](#), [Exhibit G-9](#), [Exhibit G-10](#), [Exhibit G-11](#), [Exhibit G-12](#), [Exhibit G-13](#), and [Exhibit G-14](#).)

Discussion ensued between Special Master Erickson and Mr. Steslow regarding whether the information provided in maps G-1, G-2, and G-3, is representative of the total population or VAP. Mr. Steslow said that the maps represent total population over 35 percent and further explained that VAP and the use of communities of interest for all districts would be the best population criteria to determine the final maps.

- Dr. Thomas Brunell, previously identified, was of the opinion that the two redistricting plans, S.B. 497 and A.B. 593, systematically favored the Democratic Party. He explained the process of gerrymandering and opined when a party wins a majority of the votes it should have the majority of the seats. Dr. Brunell focused his comments on representational fairness and stated that the final redistricting plan should not bias one party over another. He provided graphs to support his findings and explained the courts use homogenous precincts and ecological regression to determine whether racial block voting exists. Dr. Brunell shared additional test utilizing data from the 2010 Election of the Clark County School Board District D and the 2011 Election for the Las Vegas City Council Ward. Concluding, he suggested that the Special Masters draw districts that elect the candidate of choice of minority voters and noted that the preservation of communities of interest is still central to redrawing electoral lines. (Please see [Exhibit H](#).)

In response to Special Master Glover’s comments regarding the outcome of the *amici curiae* brief filed in the U.S. Supreme Court (*Eddie Jackson; League of United Latin America Citizens; Travis County; GI Forum of Texas v. Rick Perry, et al.*), Dr. Brunell indicated that the U.S. Supreme Court has not made a decision on partisan gerrymandering and explained that it is not illegal.

- Daniel H. Stewart, previously identified, expressed concern regarding an earlier statement that indicated majority-minority districts are unconstitutional if CVAP requirements are not met. He clarified that Mr. Garza, previously identified, had not proposed any plans that subordinate the traditional districting principles and noted the differences between CVAP and majority-minority districts. Mr. Stewart shared a map ([Exhibit I](#)) provided by Mr. Garza, on behalf of Hispanics for Fair Representation, Senate Plan, as an example of how the maps could be drawn using traditional districting principles to create majority-minority districts.
- Mr. Garza briefly shared his personal and professional community involvement and emphasized that the Latino community would like to have equal representation at all levels of government without sharing with other communities of interest.

Discussion ensued between Mr. Stewart and Mr. Garza regarding Map No. 6, presented by Mr. Steslow ([Exhibit G-6](#)), and the representation of a cohesive and compact community of interest. Mr. Garza commented that Map No. 6 maintains separate minority districts, which does not disenfranchise other communities of interest.

Continuing, Mr. Stewart and Mr. Garza discussed the exclusion of Hispanic candidates from the current electoral process, and questioned if a majority-minority Latino district would create fair and equal representation. Mr. Garza opined there is an inequality in the election process at the State and federal levels, and emphasized that this is the time to make the changes necessary to provide equal representation to the Latino community. In conclusion, he indicated that the creation of a majority-minority district would promote greater participation in all levels of government from the Latino community.

- Annette Teijeirio, M.D., Anesthesiologist, Las Vegas, stated her family has lived in Nevada for over 35 years, and opined it is time for equitable representation in the Hispanic community. She agreed with Mr. Garza regarding partisan fairness and emphasized that the needs of the Hispanic community should be addressed by its elected leaders.

In response to Mr. Stewart regarding past discrimination within the Hispanic community and the difficulties that Hispanic preferred candidates face in current elections, Dr. Teijeirio responded that the Legislature does not reflect the population diversity in Nevada. She is of the opinion that there is a “huge” disparity in representation and if fair representation existed, it would be reflected at the federal, State, and local levels.

Responding to Mr. Stewart's query regarding the creation of majority-minority districts and the preservation of communities of interest in the Hispanic community, Dr. Teijeirio stated that an elected leader in the Hispanic community must be immersed in the culture and have strong ties to the Hispanic community or live in the community to understand the culture and the community interest.

- Chair Sheets gave direction regarding public comment and asked that comments be limited to ten minutes.

PUBLIC COMMENT

- Dr. Michael Scott Green, private citizen, Las Vegas, presented his résumé, which details his professional accomplishments relating to government and elections ([Exhibit J](#)). He shared his thoughts on political diversity, the boundaries of the four congressional districts, the rapid growth in the Hispanic community, residential groups of common interest, and the less populous minority ethnic groups. Dr. Green provided a map and written remarks ([Exhibit J](#)) based on historical growth patterns and the current political makeup of Nevada's population. He explained how he created the division of the districts and noted that a few geographic distinctions are necessary to achieve balance and avoid gerrymandering.
- Woody Stroupe, Vice Chairman, Clark County Republican Party, speaking as a private citizen, testified that there is a need for a fair election through the creation of districts that are compact, contiguous, and shaped to establish cohesive representation and reserve communities of interest and nesting within the city. He encouraged support for a timely conclusion to the redistricting process.
- Kathleen Bienenstein, private citizen, and member of the League of Women Voters, presented written testimony titled "Congressional District Plans Proposed by the Grassroots Team" ([Exhibit K](#)). She explained that the Team submitted plans that develop congressional districts and focus entirely on developing boundaries free from gerrymandering and without partisan interests. Ms. Bienenstein reported that there are two plans, Plan A and Plan B, available on the Nevada Legislature website: <http://leg.state.nv.us/Division/Research/Districts/Reapp/2011/PubProposals.cfm>. She explained the process for developing the plans and cited case law given in *Abrams v. Johnson*, 521 U.S. 74 (1997) [117 S.Ct. 1925] as criteria in preparing the data. Ms. Bienenstein shared a map illustration that the Team created to emphasize the difficulty in creating a majority Hispanic population congressional district in Clark County. In conclusion, she noted the Team decided it is not necessary to draw a Hispanic majority congressional district and reported the Team has not submitted a plan for Senate legislative districts.

- Chair Sheets clarified that the maps shown on pages 4 and 5 of [Exhibit K](#) represent Plan B and are the preferred Grassroots Team plans proposed by the League of Women Voters.

Responding to Special Master Glover, Ms. Bienenstein explained that by using voter registration and actual party turnout data the Grassroots Team was able to develop the boundaries by use of a fair representation of the party, with the exception of Douglas County, as opposed to individual neighborhoods drawn along party lines.

- Sam King, President, League of Women Voters of Nevada, shared that although the Grassroots Team maps were drawn for congressional districts, the same premise should be followed for senatorial districts.
- Vicenta Montoya, private citizen, provided her written testimony ([Exhibit L](#)) and expressed concerns regarding Latino representation in Clark County. She defined herself as an activist within the Latino community. Ms. Montoya supports the concept of nesting and explained how her maps ([Exhibit L-1](#)) differ from those presented by the Democratic and Republican parties.
- Rick Houghtelling, private citizen, presented written testimony regarding the use of gerrymandering and the election process. He asked the Special Masters to determine the new districts using the VRA. (Please see [Exhibit M.](#))
- Yvette Williams, Caucus Chair, Clark County Democratic Black Caucus, North Las Vegas, presented testimony in support of the preservation and integrity of the district lines in the historical Westside and immediate areas of Clark County. She stated that it is the responsibility of the Nevada Legislature to represent the interests of its constituents and to be accountable to those it serves. She reported that it is the opinion of the Caucus that the Legislature should reconvene to decide the redistricting plan. (Please see [Exhibit N.](#))

Ms. Williams shared her concerns regarding the application of the VRA and data from the CVAP, and stated that communities of interest should not be disenfranchised in the redistricting process.

In response to Special Master Erickson's request for clarification, Ms. Williams explained that the boundaries of the historical Westside African American community should include those neighborhoods where expansion, improvement, and redevelopment have taken place.

- Larry Badgley, private citizen, expressed his concerns about charges of gerrymandering. Mr. Badgley stated he supports the plan for a congressional representative that falls within the directives established by the U.S. Supreme Court. He based his views on recent polls from several of the major news agencies and a review of the plans submitted by both parties. (Please see [Exhibit O.](#))

- Marco Rauda, private citizen, testified regarding the Latino population. He shared that many community groups of interest exist within the Latino community from northeast Las Vegas to Henderson and should not be combined as one group or defined by race. He is opposed to creating a redistricting plan that will divide the Latino community among racial lines. Mr. Rauda explained that a fair redistricting plan would not disenfranchise or diminish the ability of the Latino community to align with all Nevadans.
- Dan Burdish, private citizen, suggested that the Special Masters take into consideration the redistricting standards noted in the *Official Code of Iowa* ([Exhibit P](#)) and utilize the following six criteria:
 1. Equality of population;
 2. District boundaries shall coincide with the boundaries of political subdivisions of the state;
 3. Districts shall be composed of convenient contiguous territory;
 4. Districts shall be reasonably compact in form (square, rectangular, or hexagonal in shape, not irregular shaped);
 5. No district shall be drawn for the purpose of favoring a political party, incumbent legislator or member of Congress, or other person or group; and
 6. To minimize electoral confusion and facilitate communication that each representative district is wholly included within a single senatorial district, each representative and each senatorial district shall be included within a single congressional district.

Mr. Burdish noted that since Iowa has implemented these standards there have been no issues regarding redistricting.

- Richard F. Boulware, Esquire, Vice President, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), Las Vegas Chapter, and President of the Las Vegas Chapter, National Bar Association, testified regarding underrepresented minority groups, the history of discrimination, and the historic African American community in Nevada. He expressed concern regarding combining the Latino community and the African American community in the same district. Mr. Boulware suggested the creation of a crossover district as determined by the U.S. Supreme Court in *Bartlett v. Strickland*.
- Jose Solorio, private citizen, presented a map of Nevada that highlights the key areas of Latino communities of interest and explained that his map is independent and party neutral. (Please see [Exhibit Q](#).)
- Joseph (Joe) M. Neal Jr., former Nevada State Senator, and an NAACP member, spoke regarding the historical African American community in Las Vegas and the

significance of the boundaries in Congressional District No. 4. He shared his experience with reapportionment during his legislative tenure and further explained that defining the terms “Hispanic” and “Latino” would assist in a better understanding of representation within the diverse communities in and around the Las Vegas area.

- Fernando Romero, State Director for Democrats USA, testified regarding the disparity between the Hispanic communities and his disagreement with the idea of nesting all minority communities together. He noted strong opposition to the Republican map presented by Mr. Garza, which he noted groups the Latino community into one district. Mr. Romero supports the map submitted by Mr. Solorio ([Exhibit Q](#)) and a map submitted by the Nevada Latino Redistricting Coalition.
- Special Master Erickson verified that the map submitted by the Nevada Latino Redistricting Coalition was presented during the 2011 Legislative Session and is available in the Legislative Counsel Bureau database.
- Anita Wood, Councilwoman, City of North Las Vegas, presented a chart that details the percentage of registered voters in each representative’s district. She highlighted the representatives who have 80 percent or more constituents in Clark County, Las Vegas, and Henderson, and noted how this data affects the city of North Las Vegas. Ms. Wood requested the Special Masters to create maps that promote equal representation for all constituents in the city of North Las Vegas allowing for higher percentage of representation by at least two representatives. (Please see [Exhibit R](#).)

Discussion ensued between Special Master Glover and Ms. Wood regarding the effect on communities of interest and Henderson if the boundary lines in North Las Vegas were changed to provide a greater percentage of representation to at least two representatives. Ms. Wood responded that because of the high minority population it would allow these groups to have separate representation and not create nesting. She explained that Henderson is physically larger than North Las Vegas, which she opined is primarily due to North Las Vegas not being fully developed.

Special Master Erickson commented that the data compiled in [Exhibit R](#) gave a different perspective to the Special Masters and asked if the data was accessible for use in the final translation of the redistricting process. He further inquired about the percentage that North Las Vegas would aim for in representation in both the Senate and Assembly. In response to Special Master Erickson’s inquiry regarding the percentage of representation, Ms. Wood responded that she would provide the information to the Special Masters and added that the Senate representation should be 70 percent or higher and the Assembly representation should be 80 percent to 90 percent.

- Miguel Narvaez, private citizen, testified regarding nesting and balancing representation in the Hispanic community. He noted his support for the maps presented

by Mr. Garza ([Exhibit I](#)) and Mr. Solorio ([Exhibit Q](#)), which he opined more appropriately address the Hispanic communities' needs. Mr. Narvaez expressed strong concern regarding congressional representation for the Hispanic community that allows the Hispanic voice to be heard.

- Omar Lopez, private citizen, expressed his support of the maps presented by Mr. Garza ([Exhibit I](#)) and Mr. Solorio ([Exhibit Q](#)).
- Chair Sheets thanked the public and all participants in the discussion and commented on the value of the testimony received. He stated the next hearing would be held in Carson City, on Tuesday, October 11, 2011.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the hearing was adjourned at 3:48 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tracey L. Wineglass
Senior Research Secretary

Brian L. Davie
Legislative Services Officer

APPROVED BY:

Thomas R. Sheets, Esquire, Chair

Date: _____

LIST OF EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the “Meeting Notice and Agenda” provided by Lorne J. Malkiewich, Director, Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB).

[Exhibit B](#) is a court brief dated September 16, 2011, titled “Proposed Directives of the Court to the Redistricting Special Masters Panel Regarding Legal Issues,” prepared by Denise Pifer, Esquire, Law Offices of Karen A. Connelley, representing the League of Women Voters, Las Vegas.

[Exhibit C](#) is the court order Case No. 11-OC-00042-1B that references the courts findings of August 3 and August 4, 2011, dated September 21, 2011, transmitted from Judge James Todd Russell, First Judicial District Court, Carson City and Storey County, presented by Kevin J. Hamilton, Esquire, Perkins, Coie, LLP, Seattle, Washington.

[Exhibit D](#) is a résumé provided by Stephen Ansolabehere, Ph.D., Professor of Government at Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

[Exhibit D-1](#) is a court brief dated September 14, 2011, titled “Plaintiffs’ Initial Expert Witness Disclosure,” submitted by Bradley S. Schrager, Esquire, Jones Vargas, Las Vegas.

[Exhibit D-2](#) is a report dated September 12, 2011, titled “Report on the Demography and Voting Behavior of Racial and Ethnic Groups in the State of Nevada” prepared by Stephen Ansolabehere, Ph.D., Professor of Government at Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

[Exhibit D-3](#) is a court brief dated October 6, 2011, titled “Rebuttal Report of Plaintiffs’ Expert Witness,” submitted by Bradley S. Schrager, Esquire, Jones Vargas, Las Vegas.

[Exhibit D-4](#) is a report dated October 5, 2011, titled “Rebuttal Report: Voting Behavior in Nevada and Principles for Redistricting” prepared by Stephen Ansolabehere, Ph.D., Professor of Government at Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

[Exhibit E](#) is a map titled “State of Nevada, United States House of Representatives Proposed Plan,” provided by Bradley S. Schrager, Esquire, Jones Vargas, Las Vegas.

[Exhibit E-1](#) is a map titled “State of Nevada, United States House of Representatives Las Vegas Detail Proposed Plan,” presented by Bradley S. Schrager, Esquire, Jones Vargas, Las Vegas.

[Exhibit E-2](#) is a map titled “State of Nevada, Assembly Districts Las Vegas Detail Proposed Plan,” offered by Bradley S. Schrager, Esquire, Jones Vargas, Las Vegas.

[Exhibit E-3](#) is a map titled “State of Nevada, Senate Districts Las Vegas Detail Proposed Plan,” submitted by Bradley S. Schrager, Esquire, Jones Vargas, Las Vegas.

[Exhibit E-4](#) is a map titled “Nevada Assembly Plan SB 497 Clark County, Census Place,” provided by Bradley S. Schrager, Esquire, Jones Vargas, Las Vegas.

[Exhibit E-5](#) is a map titled “Nevada Senate Plan SB 497 Clark County, Census Place,” provided by Bradley S. Schrager, Esquire, Jones Vargas, Las Vegas.

[Exhibit E-6](#) is a map titled “Nevada Congressional District Plan Draft (10092011),” provided by Bradley S. Schrager, Esquire, Jones Vargas, Las Vegas.

[Exhibit F](#) is a letter dated April 2, 2011, sent via electronic mail from Ann Brauer, private citizen, Indian Springs, Nevada, on behalf of the Indian Springs Town Advisory Board.

[Exhibit G](#) is a map titled “Asian Population by Census Block,” provided by Ron Steslow, Redistricting Director, Fund for Nevada’s Future, Las Vegas.

[Exhibit G-1](#) is a map titled “African American Population by Census Block,” presented by Ron Steslow, Redistricting Director, Fund for Nevada’s Future, Las Vegas.

[Exhibit G-2](#) is a map titled “Hispanic Population by Census Block,” offered by Ron Steslow, Redistricting Director, Fund for Nevada’s Future, Las Vegas.

[Exhibit G-3](#) is a map titled “Democrat Plan, Senate Bill 497 by Census Block,” presented by Ron Steslow, Redistricting Director, Fund for Nevada’s Future, Las Vegas.

[Exhibit G-4](#) is a map titled “Democrat Plan, Assembly Bill 533 by Census Block,” provided by Ron Steslow, Redistricting Director, Fund for Nevada’s Future, Las Vegas.

[Exhibit G-5](#) is a map titled “Republican Congressional Plan,” presented by Ron Steslow, Redistricting Director, Fund for Nevada’s Future, Las Vegas.

[Exhibit G-6](#) is a map titled “1992 Texas Plans, Congressional District 18,” submitted by Ron Steslow, Redistricting Director, Fund for Nevada’s Future, Las Vegas.

[Exhibit G-7](#) is a map titled “1992 Texas Plans, Congressional District 29,” presented by Ron Steslow, Redistricting Director, Fund for Nevada’s Future, Las Vegas.

[Exhibit G-8](#) is a map titled “1992 Texas Plans, Congressional District 30,” provided by Ron Steslow, Redistricting Director, Fund for Nevada’s Future, Las Vegas.

[Exhibit G-9](#) is a map titled “Gerrymandered Congressional Districts in Select States,” offered by Ron Steslow, Redistricting Director, Fund for Nevada’s Future, Las Vegas.

[Exhibit G-10](#) is a map titled “Republican Senate Plan,” provided by Ron Steslow, Redistricting Director, Fund for Nevada’s Future, Las Vegas.

[Exhibit G-11](#) is a map titled “2010 General Election Nevada State Senate: Votes Cast,” presented by Ron Steslow, Redistricting Director, Fund for Nevada’s Future, Las Vegas.

[Exhibit G-12](#) is a map titled “Party Composition Nevada State Senate: Number of Seats,” submitted by Ron Steslow, Redistricting Director, Fund for Nevada’s Future, Las Vegas.

[Exhibit G-13](#) is a map titled “2010 General Election Nevada State Assembly: Votes Cast,” presented by Ron Steslow, Redistricting Director, Fund for Nevada’s Future, Las Vegas.

[Exhibit G-14](#) is a map titled “Party Composition Nevada State Assembly: Number of Seats,” provided by Ron Steslow, Redistricting Director, Fund for Nevada’s Future, Las Vegas.

[Exhibit H](#) is a packet of information offered by Thomas L. Brunell, Ph.D., Professor of Political Science, Senior Associate Dean, School of Economic Political and Policy Sciences, University of Texas at Dallas, Dallas, Texas.

- A résumé;
- A Microsoft PowerPoint presentation titled “Nevada Redistricting Representational Fairness and Racial Bloc Voting”; and
- The *amici curiae* brief filed in the U.S. Supreme Court (*Eddie Jackson; League of United Latin America Citizens; Travis County; GI Forum of Texas v. Rick Perry, et al.*).

[Exhibit I](#) is a map dated June 3, 2011, titled “Hispanics for Fair Representation Senate Plan” submitted by Alex Garza, private citizen, Las Vegas.

[Exhibit J](#) is a packet of information provided by Michael Scott Green, private citizen, Las Vegas.

- A résumé;
- A document titled “The People’s Map, Redistricting: Congressional”; and
- Written testimony.

[Exhibit K](#) is the written testimony of Kathleen Bienenstein titled “Congressional District Plans Proposed by the Grassroots Team,” Las Vegas.

[Exhibit L](#) is the written testimony of Vincenta Montoya, private citizen, Las Vegas.

[Exhibit L-1](#) is a map dated May 5, 2011, titled “State of Nevada Congressional Plan,” offered by Vincenta Montoya, private citizen, Las Vegas.

[Exhibit M](#) is the written testimony of Rick Houghtelling, private citizen, Las Vegas.

[Exhibit N](#) is the written testimony of Yvette Williams, Caucus Chair, Clark County Democratic Black Caucus, Las Vegas.

[Exhibit O](#) is the written testimony provided by Larry Badgley, private citizen, Las Vegas.

[Exhibit P](#) is the *Official Code of Iowa*, presented by Dan Burdish, private citizen, Las Vegas.

[Exhibit Q](#) is a map dated October 10, 2011, titled “Congressional Redistricting: Solorio Map” presented by Jose Solorio, private citizen, Las Vegas.

[Exhibit R](#) is a chart provided by Anita Wood, Councilwoman, North Las Vegas.

This set of “Summary Minutes and Action Report” is supplied as an informational service. Exhibits in electronic format may not be complete. Copies of the complete exhibits, other materials distributed at the meeting, and the audio record are on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, Carson City, Nevada. You may contact the Library online at www.leg.state.nv.us/lcb/research/library/feedbackmail.cfm or telephone: 775/684-6827.