

NEVADA LEGISLATURE LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION'S COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE REQUIREMENTS FOR REAPPORTIONMENT AND REDISTRICTING

(Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 19, File No. 76, Statutes of Nevada 2009)

SUMMARY MINUTES AND ACTION REPORT

The second meeting of the Legislative Commission's Committee to Study the Requirements for Reapportionment and Redistricting was held on May 17, 2010, at 9 a.m. in Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 2135 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. A copy of this set of "Summary Minutes and Action Report," including the "Meeting Notice and Agenda" (Exhibit A) and other substantive exhibits, is available on the Nevada Legislature's website at http://www.leg.state.nv.us/interim/75th2009/committee/. In addition, copies of the audio record may be purchased through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (e-mail: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775/684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT IN LAS VEGAS:

Assemblyman Tick Segerblom, Chair Senator Steven A. Horsford, Vice Chair Senator John J. Lee Senator Joyce Woodhouse Assemblyman John Oceguera

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT IN CARSON CITY:

Senator Mike McGinness Senator William J. Raggio Assemblywoman Heidi S. Gansert Assemblywoman Debbie Smith

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU STAFF PRESENT:

Lorne J. Malkiewich, Director, Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB)

Donald O. Williams, Research Director, Research Division

Brian L. Davie, Legislative Services Officer, Administrative Division

Michael J. Stewart, Supervising Principal Research Analyst, Research Division

Eileen G. O'Grady, Chief Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division

Kristin C. Roberts, Senior Principal Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division

Eric Dugger, Network Services/Support Manager, Information Technology Services Unit

Kathy Steinle, Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Specialist, Information Technology Services Unit

Jeanne Peyton, Senior Research Secretary, Research Division

OPENING REMARKS

Chair Segerblom noted that it was the second meeting of the Committee and that there would be three additional meetings prior to the 2011 Session. He outlined the activities for the meeting and stated that the goal of the Committee for the meeting was to vote on tentative approval of a software contractor. Concluding his remarks, Chair Segerblom shared that at the next meeting, scheduled for July 21, 2010, the legal issues to be considered by the Committee will be discussed, among other matters.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON FEBRUARY 12, 2010, IN LAS VEGAS, NEVADA

The Committee APPROVED THE FOLLOWING ACTION:

ASSEMBLYMAN OCEGUERA MOVED TO APPROVE THE "SUMMARY MINUTES AND ACTION REPORT" OF THE FEBRUARY 12, 2010, MEETING HELD IN LAS VEGAS, NEVADA. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY SENATOR LEE AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

STATUS REPORT ON THE DECENNIAL CENSUS

- David A. Byerman, Chief Government Liaison for Nevada, United States Department of Commerce, Census Bureau, provided a Microsoft PowerPoint presentation (Exhibit B) on Nevada's Census 2010 Campaign. His report included an update of the census process and operational timeline. Mr. Byerman outlined that:
 - 1. Door hangers were placed on homes throughout rural Nevada that do not receive home mail delivery;
 - 2. Approximately 250 questionnaire assistance centers are located throughout Nevada and there is a telephone questionnaire assistance hotline;
 - 3. The deadline for returning the census questionnaire was April 20, 2010; and
 - 4. The nonresponse follow-up process will be conducted through July 10, 2010.

Because the U.S. Census Bureau is concerned with fraud, Mr. Byerman described legitimate census employees as: (1) carrying a canvas bag; (2) displaying a census placard in their vehicle; (3) wearing an enumerator badge; and (4) carrying a photo identification. He also noted that the Census Bureau will never ask for Social Security numbers or bank account numbers, and the census questionnaire includes a total of ten questions. Mr. Byerman further explained that a small proportion of the population may be sent a more extensive questionnaire called the "American Community Survey," which is distributed on an annual basis.

Mr. Byerman indicated that the housing and foreclosure crisis has been a major obstacle in getting accurate counts because of the number of vacant homes and the variety of unusual living situations across Nevada.

Referring to a map of Nevada's counties on the Census Bureau's website at http://www.census.gov (Exhibit B), Mr. Byerman stated that the 2010 Census Campaign has had a successful response rate in Nevada, except for some of the rural communities that had a decline. He noted that the decline will not affect the counts since the census enumerators will visit each home to obtain the necessary information.

Mr. Byerman reported that a strong participation from both the public and private sectors included: (1) a series of promotional videos produced by KLVX 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 participation in the census to 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 difficulty obtaining responses.

In closing, Mr. Byerman explained that the result of the census count should be successful for Nevada in terms of gaining the fourth Congressional seat and also by maximizing its return on investment for the Campaign. The Census Bureau continues to work with local partners to encourage people to participate in the 2010 Census.

· Assemblyman Oceguera thanked Mr. Byerman for doing an excellent job.

UPDATE ON PHASE II VOTING DISTRICT/BLOCK BOUNDARY SUGGESTION PROJECT

- Kathy Steinle, GIS Specialist, Information Technology Services Unit, LCB, provided an update on the Phase II Voting District/Block Boundary Suggestion Project for all counties in Nevada, with the exception of Clark County. Ms. Steinle reported that the verification phase of the Phase II Project was completed by the April 2, 2010, deadline. She noted that previous submissions to the Census Bureau were reviewed, corrections made, and the new information submitted to the Census Bureau. (Please see Exhibit C-1.)
- Brian L. Davie, Legislative Services Officer, Administrative Division, LCB, provided an update on the Phase II Voting District/Block Boundary Suggestion Project for Clark County. Mr. Davie stated that the verification portion of the Phase II Project is completed and was submitted to the Census Bureau on March 29, 2010. Mr. Davie's presentation included comments on: (1) Nevada's "southern problem area" where precincts formerly could not be identified; (2) precinct splits that occurred due to population growth; and (3) precinct combinations in areas with little or no population. (Please see Exhibit C-2.)

Responding to Chair Segerblom regarding whether the voting numbers will match the Census data, Mr. Davie said that when the precinct data is received, it will be matched with the numbers from three previous election cycles for the Legislature's use in the redistricting process.

OVERVIEW OF OPTIONS FOR REDISTRICTING SOFTWARE AND RECOMMENDATION CONCERNING ACQUISITION OF SOFTWARE

Kathy Steinle, previously identified, provided the Committee with a comparison of the two primary vendors that develop redistricting software. She stated that Citygate GIS produces the autoBound Redistricting and Reapportionment System, and Caliper Corporation produces the Maptitude software. Ms. Steinle outlined each system for the Committee by: (1) application; (2) staff familiarity; (3) support; (4) pre-redistricting value; and (5) pricing. She mentioned that if Nevada's counties are interested in purchasing a license to redistrict their county commissioners or school districts, the counties can participate in buying the licenses with the Legislature, which would lower the overall per license fee. (Please see Exhibit D-2, Exhibit D-3, and Exhibit D-4.)

In response Senator Raggio's query about how staff determines the number of licenses that will be needed and the major differences between Caliper Corporation and Citygate GIS, Ms. Steinle said the Legislature reviewed the number of licenses purchased for the 2000 redistricting project, which consisted of a total of eight licenses—two for public workstations, four for redistricting staff, and two for permanent staff. She also responded that the major difference between the two systems is the base GIS system autoBound is built on the industry standard and allows staff to do more analysis of the data, whereas, Maptitude provides its own base system. Ms. Steinle added that staff is familiar with autoBound because it has been used by the Nevada Legislature for the past 20 years.

Responding to Assemblywoman Gansert's question about the cost of maintenance for each system and if the programs convert to a standard format, Ms. Steinle explained that: (1) autoBound maintenance is an additional cost of \$2,300 for a primary license for a one-year period, which also includes ten secondary licenses; and (2) Maptitude will export a plan to a standard format that Environmental Systems Research Institute (ESRI) software can interpret and use.

In reply to Senator McGinness about the time delay in receiving updates from Maptitude, Ms. Steinle referred to Exhibit D-4, page 2, which states "Caliper provides timely updates of new data as the Census Bureau releases them." She indicated that she has not been able to talk to the sales representative on what the turnaround time is but will share that information with the Committee after she has spoken with a Mapitude agent.

Responding to Senator McGinness's query whether autoBound is used for the Nevada Legislature's website system as well, Ms. Steinle said that another application written by ESRI is used that is directed to the Internet. She explained that autoBound is a separate company that only writes the extension for the ESRI product.

Lorne J. Malkiewich, Director, LCB, noted that Maptitude also has a discount depending on the number of licenses purchased. He indicated that final approval of a software program will not be obtained until the August 13, 2010, Legislative Commission meeting. However, staff would like to have a decision on which program to purchase so that the other entities can be contacted to determine if any are interested in buying the same product, which would lower the total cost per license.

The Committee **APPROVED THE FOLLOWING ACTION**:

SENATOR LEE MOVED TO TENTATIVELY APPROVE THE AUTOBOUND REDISTRICTING AND REAPPORTIONMENT SYSTEM BY CITYGATE GIS AND DIRECTED STAFF TO SEEK ADDITIONAL PARTICIPATION FROM OTHER INTERESTED ENTITIES AND REPORT BACK TO THE COMMITTEE AT ITS JULY 21, 2010, MEETING. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN OCEGUERA AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

OVERVIEW OF OPTIONS FOR REDISTRICTING HARDWARE FOR SESSION AND FOR PUBLIC WORKSTATIONS AND RECOMMENDATION CONCERNING ACQUISITION OF HARDWARE

- Kathy Steinle, previously identified, reviewed the hardware used during the 2001 Session for redistricting, additional staff that was hired for the project, and the location of each workstation. (Please see Exhibit E.)
- Eric Dugger, Network Services/Support Services Manager, Information Technology Services Unit, LCB, reviewed the basic hardware components and printers that would need to be purchased for each station. He outlined the various types of hardware, printers, viewing options, the environments where each workstation would be placed, and the mobile capabilities. In closing, Mr. Dugger explained that staff will select hardware to accommodate the setups chosen by the Committee. (Please see Exhibit F.)
- Lorne J. Malkiewich, previous identified, added that the price of the eight licenses would be included with the hardware costs. He also noted that during the 2001 Session, the workstations were set up in the following locations—one in each caucus room, two public workstations, and two for staff. He expressed that the Committee should contemplate what hardware would be needed for the caucuses. Mr. Malkiewich explained that the hardware choice should be made in conjunction with the software decision. He advised the Committee to contact Ms. Steinle or Mr. Dugger with any questions prior to the July 21, 2010, meeting so that a recommendation for the hardware and software to be purchased can be finalized at that time.

Responding to Mr. Malkiewich regarding the type of public workstations that staff was planning to use for the 2011 Session, Mr. Dugger said the workstations would be similar to the 2001 Session and described them as a dedicated workstation with a larger screen measuring approximately 24 to 26 inches wide with a desktop printer

PUBLIC COMMENT

 Scott Wasserman, Chief Executive Officer and Special Counsel to the Board of Regents, Nevada System of Higher Education, Reno, Nevada, indicated that the University System is interested in purchasing an autoBound license.

ADJOURNMENT

Assemblyman Tick Segerblom, Chair

There being no further business to at 10:09 a.m.	come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned
	Respectfully submitted,
	Jeanne Peyton Senior Research Secretary
	Lorne J. Malkiewich Director
APPROVED BY:	

LIST OF EXHIBITS

<u>Exhibit A</u> is the "Meeting Notice and Agenda," provided by Lorne J. Malkiewich, Director, Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB).

<u>Exhibit B</u> is a presentation handout titled "Nevada's Census 2010 Campaign: *We All Count*," dated May 17, 2010, provided by David A. Byerman, Chief Government Liaison for Nevada, United States Department of Commerce, Census Bureau.

Exhibit C-1 is the written testimony of Kathy Steinle, Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Specialist, Information Technology Services, LCB, titled "Update on Phase II Voting District/Block Boundary Suggestion Project.

<u>Exhibit C-2</u> is the written testimony of Brian L. Davie, Legislative Services Officer, Administrative Division, LCB, titled "Report to the Committee to Study Requirements for Reapportionment and Redistricting," dated May 17, 2010.

<u>Exhibit D-1</u> is the written testimony of Kathy Steinle, GIS Specialist, Information Technology Services Unit, LCB, titled "Overview of Options for Redistricting Software and Recommendation Concerning Acquisition of Software."

<u>Exhibit D-2</u> is an outline titled "Overview of Options for Redistricting Software and Recommendation Concerning Acquisition of Software," submitted by Kathy Steinle, GIS Specialist, Information Technology Services Unit, LCB.

<u>Exhibit D-3</u> is a brochure titled "autoBound Redistricting and Reapportionment System," submitted by Kathy Steinle, GIS Specialist, Information Technology Services Unit, LCB.

<u>Exhibit D-4</u> is a brochure titled "Maptitude Software, Data, and Services for Redistricting," submitted by Kathy Steinle, GIS Specialist, Information Technology Services Unit, LCB.

Exhibit E is the written testimony of Kathy Steinle, GIS Specialist, Information Technology Services Unit, Administrative Division, LCB, titled "Overview of Options for Redistricting Hardware for Session and for Public Workstations and Recommendation Concerning Acquisition of Hardware."

<u>Exhibit F</u> is a presentation titled "GIS Hardware – Items for Consideration," submitted by Eric Dugger, Network Services/Support Services Manager, Information Technology Services Unit, LCB.

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.