

in front of you which basically isolate the counties in question, there's just barely over 130,000 people, following the 1990 census, that live in these counties. Those counties prior to LB 614 had five different senators representing that geography. With the new target of 32,212 people, and you divide that into the 130,000 people, these counties are, under federal standards associated with the one-person, one-vote standard, only entitled to four senators. That meant one senator's district, or one district as it was known, had to be eliminated. Under LB 614, as you well know, Madison County was identified for some good, particular purposes that why Madison County was the one that was eliminated and melded in with the others. Some of those things being that any time you have a dense population you can use that particular county much more readily to not have to rearrange near as much geography to accomplish the task of melding one of those out. And so it was identified and there were all kinds of other rationales that were used as to why that was an appropriate decision. Under the Supreme Court filing, it was determined that one should follow county lines in cases where you have a possible targeted population within the confines of that county. And they requested that Madison County be reinstated. That left a rather difficult task for the committee, because we're talking about a corner that's bordered by South Dakota and bordered by Iowa. We have a county of Thurston County, which is...all of that county and including a little overhang, if you will, into some of the neighboring counties, are federal Indian reservations, and there are certain protections that are afforded the reservations and the sovereign governments of those entities such that that created another barrier. The Supreme Court then put a rather large pillar, that being Madison County, in front of us and said you've got three districts left, in essence, to reconfigure in such a way that this would work. I offered LB 7 as a starting point, and we discussed it in committee the other day. What LB 7 basically did was said let's look at it from the most simplistic way. You have District 40, you have District 18, both deemed unconstitutional, both of them being having to be drawn out of Madison County, and they have to be basically put back together as even numbered districts. The only territory between the two to make them contiguous, in essence, is District 19. And so the theory then started to fall into two camps, one is do you make Madison County an even numbered district, or do you make it an odd numbered district. If you make it an odd numbered district, they have an election this fall, as some committee members felt was the mandate of the court and following through with the