Reapportionment and Redistricting News

This newsletter is the second of several that will be published by the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) in 2010 and 2011. Similar newsletters were produced in 1990-1991 and 1999-2001 (Volume 1). The 2010-2011 newsletters (Volume 2) will feature information regarding Nevada’s reapportionment and redistricting process, summaries of interim study committee activities, overviews of relevant Census 2010 data, and other pertinent information. Copies of the newsletters will be posted on the website for the Legislative Commission’s Committee to Study the Requirements for Reapportionment and Redistricting at http://www.leg.state.nv.us/Interim/75th2009/Committee/Studies/ Redistrict/ID=57.

Please contact Michael J. Stewart, Supervising Principal Research Analyst, Research Division, LCB, at (775) 684-6825 with any questions or suggestions concerning the newsletter. Additional information regarding reapportionment and redistricting can be found at the Committee’s website or on the National Conference of State Legislatures’ website (http://www.ncsl.org) under the “Legislatures & Elections” tab.
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NEWSLETTER

Reapportionment and Redistricting Holds Its First Two Meetings

The Legislative Commission’s Committee to Study the Requirements for Reapportionment and Redistricting held its first meeting on February 12 and its second meeting on May 17. At its February meeting, the Committee discussed numerous issues and heard a presentation by Secretary of State Ross Miller concerning Nevada’s efforts to promote participation in the 2010 Census. The Committee also heard the final presentation on computerized redistricting software and heard an update on the California experience with redistricting software. At its May meeting, the Committee heard an update on Phase II Voting District/Block Boundary Suggestion Project from Kathy L. Steirle, GIS Specialist, Information Technology Services Unit (ITS) Unit of the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB). In addition, a review of the basics of reapportionment and an update on the reapportionment newsletter was provided by Michael J. Stewart, Supervising Principal Research Analyst, Research Division, LCB.

During its second meeting in May, the Committee received a status report on the decennial census from Mr. Byerman and another update from Ms. Steirle on the Phase II Voting District/Block Boundary Suggestion Project. Ms. Steirle was joined by Eric Dugger, Network Support Manager, ITS Unit, LCB, in presenting the Committee with several options for redistricting software and reviewing what hardware will be necessary for the 2011 Legislative Session, such as plotters and printers, as well as personal computers to be used at public workshops. The Committee then considered recommendations concerning the acquisition of the redistricting hardware and software. This newsletter highlights some of the Committee’s discussion during the first two meetings with particular focus on census activities.

Census Update

At both Committee meetings, the Committee heard updates from Mr. Byerman on the 2010 Decennial Census, who discussed, among other things, census preparation, timelines and key deadlines, economic benefits and impacts, participation rates, and post-census follow up. Mr. Byerman noted that the census benefits Nevada by increasing Nevada’s political influence through additional representation in Congress and electoral votes, and by creating jobs and economic stimulus. He indicated that Nevada is in a position to gain a fourth congressional seat as a result of the 2010 Census, and therefore, a sixth electoral vote for the 2012, 2016, and 2020 Presidential elections. The Census Bureau also hired approximately 4,800 people throughout Nevada, opened four census offices from May 1 through July 10, 2010, as well as 250 “questionnaire assistance centers” in April. Approximately 35,000 people were tested for the 4,800 positions, the majority of whom filled jobs as enumerators.

Response Rates and Follow-Up Activities

Mr. Byerman noted that overall the Census response rate was quite good. Nevada “held the line” for Census response compared to 2000 under some very challenging economic and social scenarios. Byerman explained Nevada’s housing and foreclosure crisis, for example, has been a significant obstacle in achieving accurate counts because of the number of vacant homes and a variety of living situations across Nevada. The “mail participation rate” is the percentage of forms mailed back by households that received them. The Census Bureau developed this new measure in 2010, in part because of the current economy and higher rates of vacant housing. The rate excludes households whose forms were returned.
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Source: U.S. Census Bureau’s “Take 10” Map

Mailing questionnaires to the Census Bureau by the U.S. Postal Service as “undeliverable,” strongly suggesting the house was vacant. Any missed addresses or households that did not respond to the initial questionnaire were visited by an enumerator by July 10, 2010, to ensure that everyone was counted. The mail participation rate for Nevada as a whole was 69 percent, equal to the participation rate in 2000. Nationwide, the mail participation rate was 72 percent. Mr. Byerman noted that, when comparing the 2000 and 2010 mail participation rates, increased participation was observed in northern Nevada and rural counties in northwest Nevada; Clark County’s participation was comparable to 2000; and central and eastern Nevada rural counties showed a decline in participation.

The Census Bureau is concerned about fraudulent activities and notes that, when conducting follow-up door-to-door visits, legitimate census employees (enumerators) will always: (1) carry a canvas bag with a Census Bureau logo; (2) display a census placard in their vehicle; (3) wear an enumerator badge; and (4) carry photo identification. The Census Bureau will never ask for Social Security numbers or bank account numbers.

Statewide and Local Campaigns Encouraging Census Participation and Impact of Undercount

Both Secretary of State Ross Miller and Mr. Byerman reported on statewide efforts to promote participation in the census. Most of the funding for the statewide effort was approved by the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) in September 2009. The IFC approved $961,055 to fund the State’s census outreach activities. Of these funds, $265,816 was obligated to Web Shardick and the Ferraro Group for coordinating the outreach campaign, while $265,816 was designated for advertising and $75,000 for radio outreach. The key messaging tactics used focused on the importance of the census to Nevada, the ease of filling out the census form (“10 Questions, 10 Minutes”), and the fact that census information is confidential and safe.

Nevada’s Complete Count Campaign included “complete count committees” at the statewide level as well as in southern Nevada. Washoe County, the Carson/Douglas County region, Elko County, and the Lahomp/Nye County region. Over 1,500 organizations officially partnered with the Census Bureau to communicate the importance of the census to Nevada. Mr. Byerman explained that strong participation from both the public and private sectors included:

- A series of promotional videos produced by KLVN Channel 10 that ran on YouTube, as well as a one-hour live telephone call-in program in which a variety of community leaders participated to encourage people to take part in the census process; (2) messages from the MGM Mirage, a major partner in the 2010 Census campaign, encouraging parents to fill in the census for its 60,000 employees; and (3) coordinated events by the City of Reno, City of Sparks, and Storey County with the local complete count committees in areas where the Census Bureau had difficult obtaining responses.

Secretary Miller and Mr. Byerman stressed the importance of the outreach campaign and the impact even one missed person (or undercount) could have on Nevada. Based on federal per capita spending data, each person not counted during the 2010 Census could cost Nevada $917 per person, per year in federal funding. Over a ten-year period, this amounts to over $9,000 in potential federal funding for each uncounted person. Mr. Byerman illustrated for the Committee a scenario applying the official undercounts from the 1990 (2.3 percent) and 2000 (1.68 percent) Censuses to the $917 per person undercount. If the undercount for Nevada is 1.88 percent in 2010, it would equate to 47,066 uncounted Nevadans with a potential annual economic impact of $43.2 million. Meanwhile, if the undercount in 2010 is the same as in 1990—2.3 percent—64,436 Nevadans would be missed by the census and could potentially cost Nevada $59.1 million in annual per capita federal funding.

The American Community Survey—What Is It?

Many Nevadans have asked why they did not receive the Census Bureau’s “long form” as part of the 2010 Decennial Census. Launched in 2005, the American Community Survey (ACS) is part of the census program and is essentially what used to be the long form. Data from the ACS is collected continuously throughout the year and throughout the decade from a relatively small sample of the population (3 million addressees annually). During the decennial census program, about 250,000 households a month will receive both the ACS and the 2010 Census form. The ACS collects detailed information on the characteristics of population and housing on an ongoing basis. This data was previously collected only in census years in conjunction with the decennial census. During Census 2000, the Census Bureau asked for this detailed information from one in every six addresses using the long form. The ACS questionnaire collects nearly the same information and is sent to approximately the same number of addresses over a five-year period. However, since the ACS is conducted every year, rather than once every ten years, it provides more current data throughout the decade. Like the 2010 Census, participation in the ACS is mandatory by law and the American public’s participation is critical to provide data that impacts policy decisions on the local, state, and federal level.

**Phase II: Voting District/Block Boundary Suggestion Project (VTD/BBSP)**

Phase II VTD/BBSP is the second of five phases of the 2010 Census Redistricting Data Program authorized by Public Law 94-171, which was enacted by Congress in 1975. This law requires the Census Bureau to provide state legislatures with small area census population tabulations necessary for legislative redistricting. Most states, including Nevada, conduct reapportionment using precinct-level data, and this program allows states to submit precinct/district boundaries and codes to the Census Bureau and suggest other features so they can be assigned as census tabulation blocks for the 2010 Census. When final tabulations are released by the Census Bureau, population statistics will be available at the precinct level. Staff of the Legislative Counsel Bureau worked with all 17 counties in Nevada to ensure that accurate precinct maps and descriptions were submitted to the Census Bureau by the May 1, 2009, deadline. The verification phase of the VTD/BBSP began in February 2010 and was completed by LCB staff on March 29, 2010.

Phase III of the Redistricting Data Program involves the delivery (no later than April 1, 2011) of all available geographic products and population totals necessary for reapportionment and redistricting. The Census Bureau must then collect state legislative and congressional district plans as part of Phase IV and provide them to the U.S. Postal Service, the Department of Justice, and Congress. Finally, Phase V allows the states to conduct a review documenting the actions of the Census Bureau in their efforts to meet the Public Law 94-171 requirements.
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The Legislative Commission’s Committee to Study the Requirements for Reapportionment and Redistricting held its first meeting on February 12 and its second meeting on May 17. At its February meeting, the Committee discussed numerous issues and heard a presentation by Secretary of State Ross Miller concerning Nevada’s efforts to promote participation in the 2010 Census. David Byerman, the Chief Government Liaison for Nevada, United States Department of Commerce, also provided an overview of the census process, a discussion of job opportunities and economic stimulus in connection with the Census, the timeline for delivering reapportionment numbers to the President, the cost of a census undercount, the importance of early organization, and a status report on the statewide outreach campaign and local campaigns.

During its second meeting in May, the Committee received a status report on the decennial census from Mr. Byerman and another update from Ms. Steinle on the Phase II Voting District/Block Boundary Suggestion Project. Ms. Steinle, GIS Specialist, Information Technology Services (ITS) Unit of the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB), was provided by Michael J. Stewart, Supervising Principal Research Analyst, Research Division, LCB.

Response Rates and Follow-Up Activities

Mr. Byerman noted that overall the Census response rate was quite good. Nevada “held the line” for Census response compared to 2000 under some very challenging economic and social scenarios, Byerman explained. Nevada’s housing and foreclosure crisis, for example, has been a significant obstacle in achieving accurate counts because of the number of vacant homes and a variety of living situations across Nevada. The “mail participation rate” is the percentage of forms mailed back by households that received them. The Census Bureau developed this new measure in 2010, in part because of the current economy and higher rates of vacant housing. The rate excludes households whose forms were returned in part because of the current economy and higher rates of vacant housing. The rate excludes households whose forms were returned

Join us for the next meeting of the Committee to Study the Requirements for Reapportionment and Redistricting to be held at 9 a.m. on July 21, 2010, in Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building (555 East Washington Avenue) in Las Vegas and videoconferenced to Room 2135 of the Legislative Building in Carson City. For more information please visit the Committee’s website at http://www.leg.state.nv.us/Interim/75th2009/Committee/Studies/Redistrict/index.cfm?ID=57.