

**MINUTES OF THE JOINT MEETING  
OF THE  
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY  
AND THE  
SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY**

**Seventy-Seventh Session  
February 20, 2013**

The Joint Assembly Committee on Judiciary and the Senate Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chairman Jason Frierson at 8:05 a.m. on Wednesday, February 20, 2013, in Room 1214 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, 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 [nelis.leg.state.nv.us/77th2013](http://nelis.leg.state.nv.us/77th2013). In addition, copies of the audio record may be purchased through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: [publications@lcb.state.nv.us](mailto:publications@lcb.state.nv.us); telephone: 775-684-6835).

**ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblyman Jason Frierson, Chairman  
Assemblyman James Ohrenschall, Vice Chairman  
Assemblyman Richard Carrillo  
Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen  
Assemblywoman Olivia Diaz  
Assemblywoman Marilyn Dondero Loop  
Assemblyman Wesley Duncan  
Assemblywoman Michele Fiore  
Assemblyman Ira Hansen  
Assemblyman Andrew Martin  
Assemblywoman Ellen B. Spiegel  
Assemblyman Jim Wheeler



**SENATE COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Senator Tick Segerblom, Chairman  
Senator Ruben J. Kihuen, Vice Chairman  
Senator Aaron D. Ford  
Senator Justin C. Jones  
Senator Greg Brower  
Senator Scott Hammond  
Senator Mark Hutchison

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

None

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

None

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Dave Ziegler, Committee Policy Analyst  
Brad Wilkinson, Committee Counsel  
Nancy Davis, Committee Secretary  
Gariety Pruitt, Committee Assistant

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Catherine Cortez Masto, Attorney General  
Andrea Swanson, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Amy S. Ayoub, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Ron Chalmers, Sergeant, Reno Police Department  
Tiffany Short, Victim Specialist, Federal Bureau of Investigation  
Donald Hoier, Sergeant, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department  
William O. Voy, Judge, Eighth Judicial District  
Michon A. Martin, Chief Deputy Attorney General, Bureau of Litigation,  
Public Safety Division, Office of the Attorney General  
James R. Sweetin, Chief Deputy District Attorney, Clark County Office of  
the District Attorney  
Mark B. Jackson, District Attorney, Douglas County District  
Attorney's Office  
Dan Edwards, Bishop, Episcopal Diocese of Nevada  
Jennifer Reed, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada

Vanessa Spinazola, representing American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada  
Christopher Frey, representing Washoe County Public Defender  
Steve Yeager, representing Clark County Public Defender's Office  
Ed Uehling, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Amy Coffee, Office of the Public Defender, Clark County  
Christie Craig, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Camille Naaktgeboren, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Michael Patterson, representing Lutheran Advocacy Mission in Nevada  
and Religious Alliance in Nevada  
Melissa Holland, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada  
Aslam Abdullah, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada  
Kristine Richter, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada  
George Flint, representing Select Legal Brothels of Nevada  
Allan Smith, representing The Religious Alliance in Nevada  
Robert Roshak, representing Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association  
Eric Spratley, Lieutenant, Washoe County Sheriff's Office  
John Caparella, Nevada Resort Association  
Jade Hickman, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada  
Aubrey Hall, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada  
Marlene Lockhard, representing Nevada Women's Lobby  
Helen McPeak, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada  
Susan Meuschke, representing Nevada Network Against Domestic  
Violence  
Toshia Shaw, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Marta Poling-Goldenne, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada  
Malcolm Cohen, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Quin Rivers, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Barbara Agonia, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Tim O'Callaghan, representing Catholic Diocese of Las Vegas  
Elisa P. Cafferata, President and CEO, Nevada Advocates for Planned  
Parenthood Affiliates

**Chairman Frierson:**

[Roll called. Reviewed standing rules.] We have some very important issues before the Committee today. I would ask that we all remain respectful both of each other and the testifiers so that we can have a thorough discussion of these issues. Folks need to understand that it is our job to vet these issues and come out with legislation that accomplishes a necessary goal in a way that captures the behavior that we are targeting yet is constitutionally sound.

We will begin with Assembly Bill 67.

**Assembly Bill 67: Revises provisions relating to crimes. (BDR 3-403)**

**Catherine Cortez Masto, Attorney General:**

I would like to thank both co-chairs for agreeing to have a joint meeting on such an important topic. There are many people across the state who are here to address this issue. I look forward to an open and honest discussion with all of you. This is an important piece of legislation, and I think we can all work together to truly find some benefit and some protection for the victims in our state. [Read from prepared text ([Exhibit C](#)).]

**Andrea Swanson, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

Thank you for allowing me to address you as a joint judiciary committee. I am a school nurse in Las Vegas. I traveled here today to raise my voice as an advocate for all sex-traffic victims and also to share a personal, very painful story that my family has gone through.

I grew up in Virginia, went to college right out of high school, met a reserve officers' training corps major who became a lieutenant in the Army. We got married and travelled the world with the military. That landed us in Las Vegas in the 1990s for three years. He got out of the military after 11 years and joined the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). He currently serves as a supervisor in the Las Vegas field office.

I am a registered nurse, a registered voter, independent, and my most important role is as a mother of four. Our oldest daughter graduated from Temple University in Philadelphia and runs a private café in Chestnut Hill, Pennsylvania. Our oldest son is a lieutenant in the Marines and is in Afghanistan as we speak. Our second son is a sergeant in the 82nd Airborne Division of the United States Army, stationed in North Carolina. That leaves Hannah, our youngest daughter.

We always wondered what Hannah's life calling would be, what Hannah's future would hold. Hannah's story is much different than her brothers' and sister's. Hannah became one of Las Vegas' latest sex traffic victims in her last year of high school. Her boyfriend ended up being her pimp. We had no idea; we felt blindsided by what happened to our family. We were totally ignorant to the fact that there are pimps out there posing as everyday young adult men and recruiting our kids right out of our high schools, right out of our junior high schools or malls; these men will go anywhere that kids are, even sending someone to do their recruiting for them.

Hannah was systematically stolen from our family. It is a grooming process that I have come to learn. I wish I had no idea about any of this. I do not have that

luxury; I had to learn as much about this world as I could to help get our daughter off the streets. It is our nightmare that we are still living. She is off the streets now, but it is her reality that she will live for the rest of her life. We knew that our young daughter had some troubles in her early years of high school. We knew that she had some low self-esteem issues. We thought of her as a normal, rebellious teenager that we were actively dealing with in our family. We had no idea that the signs we were seeing at our own dining room table every night were signs of sex trafficking. We saw them as individual problems that every parent sees and deals with. Learning how to tie these problems all together, learning how they fit together, points smack dab directly to prostitution and sex trafficking. I have made it my goal to teach other parents in Las Vegas, anyone who will listen to me, so that they will not be blindsided and ignorant to this problem anymore, so that they can have it in their repertoire of things to look for that are going on in their family. I do support this bill, but my main mission is exposing and educating parents and teenagers about this problem.

I also want to tell you a little bit about Hannah's specific entry into this world. Basically these pimps groom young girls and sometimes boys, just like a child abuser would groom his victim. You take a domestic violence abuser, a rapist, and a child abuser, put them all in one, and you have a pimp. These girls become victims very quickly. They do not know about the trap they have just fallen into. These pimps disguise it with love and protection for these girls. They steal. This pimp stole our daughter from our family and replaced our positions of authority and caretaker in her life. We called the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Vice Squad when we heard a few things that did not sound like drugs, which was the worst thing we thought could happen. Vice looked into the problem and they came over to tell us our daughter was sitting in prison. We had no idea. We knew we could not contact her. She had been arrested for soliciting a police officer in front of the Mirage. My daughter had not called me for help. Who did she call? She called her pimp. He had taken that position away from us as her parents. Ultimately, we made a case against her boyfriend, and we got her off the streets within about a month and a half after calling Vice. I went to the East Coast for a family party and flew back to Las Vegas. Knowing what was going on with my daughter, I looked around the airplane and wondered which one of these men might call my daughter tonight. It was an awful feeling to know that these men were coming to this town and knowing that my daughter could be one of the people they called.

She was brought home, thankfully. Her pimp went to jail. He went to trial as he was not going to cop a deal. She was not going to testify against him. She still had that bond with him. I sat on the prosecution side every single time he

went to court. He went all the way to the last trial date and decided to cop a deal. He was convicted of attempted pandering. He was sentenced to 12 to 36 months. He would not, as I understand it, have done any of the time for this conviction except for the fact that he had broken parole when he was arrested. The first 12 months that he served was paying off his parole. He got out of prison. I did not know it. He broke a rule of his probation and was put back in and had to serve the remainder of the 12 to 36 sentence. He did do 2 1/2 years, but originally he would not have done any of that time if he had not broken the rules of his probation.

He got out at Christmas, 2012. Within two or three days of his release, my daughter was living with him in a weekly. That bond, in 2 1/2 years, was not broken. I tried my hardest. I am sure you can tell, I am a mad mom, and I was trying my hardest to give her a soft, loving place to go, but every week that she was allowed to go to the prison to visit him, she was there. Every time she had money she sent it to him for clothing, shoes, anything he could purchase in prison. She lives in a weekly with him, had his name tattooed on her ribs. He is actively showing signs of recruiting other girls as we speak. I have Facebook postings on my phone. Many of them are vile, vulgar. One of the tame ones, dated February 14, 2013, says, "I lost a few good bitches. Net me some more batter bitches." This is who my daughter lives with. "I trust you, you can call me daddy, someone to look up to." These are textbook recruiting tactics that pimps use. I have more, but I will not read them.

In closing, this is now my life's mission; to expose this and educate parents so they do not end up where I am. I have come to the conclusion that these pimps need three things from us as a society to continue, basically unchecked by Nevadans. They need our ignorance, they need our denial, and they need our inaction. They need us to be ignorant that they are out there actively recruiting. They need our denial that it could ever happen to us. I am a school nurse; my husband works for the FBI. I was in a bubble. I am here to tell you nobody lives in a bubble with these men. They need our inaction. They need us to be too scared and ashamed to act against them. I will not give them any one of these anymore. I am asking you to do the same. I have mustered my courage to tell my story today, and I am asking you to please have the courage to look hard at this bill, to look at the pieces of this bill that are so important for the protection of our girls and boys. Have the courage to vote yes on A.B. 67.

**Chairman Frierson:**

Thank you for sharing your story. This Committee is not oblivious to the bravery it takes to come forward and share your personal story in the interest of

furthering policy to help change something you are passionate about. We certainly appreciate your willingness to share with us.

**Amy S. Ayoub, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am in support of A.B. 67. About 4 1/2 years ago, on August 5, 2008, I was reading the newspaper just like any other day, and a story jumped out at me. It impacted me so much that I have carried it with me every day since. It is about Nichole Elizabeth Yegge, a 17-year-old girl who, like many of us, sometimes made good choices and sometimes made bad choices. Nichole was in and out of foster care. Her mother was on drugs and died of heart failure when Nichole was 14. For various reasons, she could not live with other family, although she had 11 family members. She was in and out of the system and would often run away. She was a good girl, a kind girl, a girl with dreams. She dreamed of getting a GED, getting her own apartment, her own job, and someday having a family of her own.

She made a very bad choice one day when she ran away for the last time and met a man named Gabriel Yates and his 21-year-old wife, Anne Osburn. He started pimping Nichole out on craigslist. Before she knew it she was in "that life." One night they had a fight and he would not let her in the apartment; he had her sleep outside in the car. She made another bad choice when a neighbor tried to help her and she said "No, I am okay, we just had a fight." The next morning, when she was allowed back in the apartment, he beat her. Trying to get out, she threatened to call the cops and tell them he was pimping out a juvenile. With that, he beat her again and knocked her down. His 21-year-old wife, who had just had a baby, sat on top of Nichole Elizabeth Yegge and strangled her to death.

Thinking that they could get away with it and hide her identity, as she lay there dead, they knocked out all her teeth, sliced off her tattoos, put her in a duffle bag, and buried her. Osburn made a bad choice also and told a friend. That friend made a good choice and called the police. That is why they were able to find Nichole, unlike so many other girls who go missing and are never found. Nichole's family was able to bury her, but they should not have had to. Anybody who hears her story has to be touched, but it went a little beyond that for me. I knew, at that moment, that could have been me. It felt like it was.

When I was Nichole's age I was doing the same thing she was, running away from home, in and out of detention centers, looking for love in all the wrong places. I was turning tricks and being beaten by pimps. I was sent to Caliente Youth Center when I was 16 and celebrated my 17th birthday in cottage B, room 11. I made a bad choice and did not take advantage of the resources that

were available there. Within a year I was a full-time prostitute. A girl I befriended introduced me to her boyfriend, and he turned me out into that lifestyle. That is how I spent my next six years. There are many stories, some I cannot remember because the pain is too great. I do remember being beaten any time I tried to get away, and I did try to get away. I remember being knocked down and my pimp standing on my hair so I could not move while he kicked every inch of my body. He caught me when I was trying to get to my mother, and he held me for three days at knifepoint and terrorized me. I never knew when he was going to beat me, but it was intermittently for those three days. No, I did not get beaten every day, but I felt like it. I knew I could be. I was mentally beaten every day.

I remember going on a "fake date" that was set up with someone from Nellis Air Force Base. Before I knew it, he was strangling me and I heard a voice from far away, screaming. It was my voice, and I thought that was the last thing I was going to hear. I was wishing he would push me out the window so my body would be found and he could not hide me. I remember always being in the fight-or-flight mentality, drinking and doing drugs to numb myself.

All I could think when I read Nichole's story was, why her and not me? Why did I live? Like Andrea's daughter, I got As in school, when I wanted to, until I chose to rebel. I carry this rosary with me, it is the only thing I have held onto from my childhood. In my nomadic life, this is the only thing I would not let go of. It was not because I thought that God and I were listening to each other, because most of the time that was not true. I did not feel that. I held onto it because it reminded me that it was given to me in seventh grade when I won the spelling bee, and I could remember that I had been a good girl, and that I did not deserve what I was going through.

Nothing changes when you turn 18. Those of you who have kids know, you do not want them to go off to college; people are still taking care of kids like that. Yet in our system, when you turn 18 everything changes. Certainly in prostitution the perception changes. As a juvenile, they are looked at as the victims they are. That should not change on their 18th birthday. It only gets harder. Even caring law enforcement can only do so much. The perception is that we are not victims anymore. Why not get out? Why not just leave? It gets harder to take the beatings; it gets harder to tolerate strange men touching what should be our precious bodies. It gets harder to justify why we have not gotten out. There were times when I had to run away and not come back into my hometown because of the fear. I stayed in the life longer than I wanted to because I was afraid to come back to the town where my family was, where



my friends were, where my support was. Not only did I think I could be like Nichole, maybe I could have been like Anne Osburn. That is how brainwashed we get. She is sitting in jail now for murder.

There were angels in my midst. My family, my friends, people always came into my life and told me they saw something in me that I had not seen in myself. They always made me feel I could do better, that I was better. Sometimes I listened and sometimes I did not. When I finally decided I wanted out, I reached out to my father, who was in Monte Carlo at the time. This put so much time and space between that lifestyle that I stayed with him. When I came back my mom's friend had a job waiting for me at a casino. This helped me not have one day of wondering what I was going to do. When you get out of that lifestyle, everything does not change. You still do not feel one bit of self-worth, and you do not suddenly have a healthy relationship with men and sex and your body and money. It is all messed up. It takes a lot to get okay.

A few years after I was out of that life, a good friend of mine had a connection with Rex Bell, Jr., former Clark County District Attorney. Mr. Bell met me, saw that I was out of the life and, without hesitation, he sealed my record. I did not have to pay money; I did not have to do anything. I would not have known that was available if it were not for Mr. Bell. I certainly would not have had enough money to pay for an attorney. That changed my life. I promise you my life would be significantly different if every time I was asked if I had been arrested, I had to say yes. It would be significantly different in this day and age, with the Internet and how easy it is to find out about people. After having that gift given to me, of having my record sealed, I still feared every day that someone would find out that I was a fraud. That I was not the person everyone thought I was. When I was doing political fundraising, especially when I had law enforcement candidates, such as the sheriff or the district attorney, I was petrified. Should I tell them? Will they know? Can they tell my record was sealed and what it was for? Will they be embarrassed? Will someone else come out and tell? I had no reason to think they would be hateful, no logical reason, but it was an overwhelming fear.

There are a lot of girls now that are tattooed once they get into the life. They have to try to physically remove the tattoo. I never had that, but I always felt like I had the word across my forehead, prostitute, only not that nice of a word. There is a time when I would have opposed this bill because self-preservation makes us start saying things and lying to ourselves just to be able to put one foot in front of the other. I would say, "I am an adult, I have a choice. It is not that bad, I could get out. I am doing this because I want to. It is powerful." I could say all those things. I did say all those things. It was only to be able to

live, to function. I had to believe that at the time, and it was a lie. I understand those who have to say it.

I am sure when my mom looked at me, no matter what, she still saw her little girl, but I had lost myself. The cops talk about girls where they act tough and that everything is okay, but their eyes are dead. We lose ourselves.

My concern is not about retribution toward the pimps, although they are violent criminals. My concern is for the girls. My concern is to do anything we can to help them get out of this life. It is not easy. Increased sentencing can help because it will keep the pimps away longer, making the girls feel safe. There are things I wish I had not done in my life. I have not spoken about this for 38 years. The shame is obviously unspeakable. The one regret that I have is never getting to look that pimp in the eye and say, "I am not afraid of you anymore." I would want to help any girl be able to look her pimp in the eye and say that; help them to testify to ensure their pimp has to take the punishment that is due. No matter what the outcome actually is, it is to support them in saying they are not afraid. This is the biggest gift you can give and will make the biggest change. I have worked very hard the last four decades to be a positive contributor to my community, to be a good person, to make amends to my family and anyone else I have hurt, to make myself and my family proud of me, to restore my sanity, and to earn the respect of people like you. The purpose of that was for this day, for me to be able to sit here. I respectfully request, I beg you, when you are voting on this bill that you remember me, Andrea's daughter, and especially Nichole Elizabeth Yegge.

**Chairman Frierson:**

Thank you. I would like to say it is not you who needs to earn our respect, it is we, as public servants, who need to earn the respect of citizens like you.

**Catherine Cortez Masto:**

I would like to say that Amy's and Andrea's stories are unique, but they are not. I can honestly tell you since I have been down this path to address this issue of sex trafficking in our state, there are many more people who have come forward to talk to me that have been touched by what we are doing. They are telling me their own stories. To hear anyone say that this does not happen in Nevada, which I wish it did not, is just false. It is happening here and it is time to take action. There is no doubt, this is the first step for us. We have so many people working on strengthening enforcement, but we also need to strengthen our victim services. There needs to be treatment in this state, which is lacking, and you cannot strengthen law enforcement without strengthening the treatment. There needs to be a place where the victims can be treated. If

we do not have a place for them, we are essentially revictimizing them. For me, this is a first step, and I hope for all of you to focus not just on the law enforcement tools we are discussing today, but to also address the treatment side of it, building that capacity and also building prevention, awareness, and education so that our kids and our parents do not fall victims to this in the future. It would not be right for me to get into the language of the bill without telling you the full story. I would like to bring some law enforcement folks up here to tell you what they are seeing on the front line, and what they have told me.

**Ron Chalmers, Sergeant, Reno Police Department:**

I am here in support of A.B. 67. I currently supervise the Regional Street Enforcement Team which is composed of detectives from the Reno Police Department, Sparks Police Department, Washoe County Sheriff's Office as well as the University of Nevada, Reno Police Department. Thirteen years ago, when I was a new detective, I was tasked with conducting undercover prostitution investigations. [Read from written text ([Exhibit D](#))].

**Tiffany Short, Victim Specialist, Federal Bureau of Investigation:**

It is a great privilege to work with survivors of sex trafficking and an honor to be speaking with you this morning. Before coming to work for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, I spent 90 days in Pattaya, Thailand working with adults and children as young as 5 who were victims of sex trafficking. [Read from written text ([Exhibit E](#)).]

**Donald Hoier, Sergeant, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:**

I have been a police officer for 21 years and have been assigned to investigate sex-trafficking-related crimes for the past 12 years. I would like to initially say that I am testifying in support of A.B. 67, and I appreciate your taking time to hear me. If you told me 12 years ago that I would be speaking about this with not only the Attorney General, but being here and speaking in front of you about this issue, I would have told you that you were crazy. This problem has existed for a long time. As a society, we have lived in a vacuum and put our heads in the sand and ignored it. Generally, prostitutes are viewed as second-class citizens. Looking back, I had those similar views, but it did not take long to figure out that I was completely wrong. I can tell you my first week in this section, we had called three girls off of the Internet, and all three of them were branded with the same tattoo, a heart with the name Andre on it, all in the same spot, right over the left breast. This is a mark they will bear for the rest of their lives. My section arrests, on average, over 5,000 individuals yearly. That is a combination of prostitutes, customers, and the people who are exploiting them. The last two years, our combined victim total between adults

and juveniles is 410. That was the result of over 407 investigations with 112 prosecutions. Since 1994, our section has recovered 2,029 juvenile victims of prostitution. In 2011 and 2012, there were a combined total of 238 juvenile victims stemming from 228 investigations with 47 prosecutions. On the adult side for the same time frame, we had 172 victims, we opened 179 investigations, and had 65 prosecutions.

I would like to state that there are people opposed to this bill who think that law enforcement believes that everyone involved in prostitution is a victim of sex trafficking. There are girls that get involved in prostitution of their own free will, but they are an extreme minority. This business is predominantly pimp controlled. A pimp controls all aspects of a prostitute's life. What she eats, what she drinks, what she thinks, the clothes she wears, her hairstyle; he controls everything. She cannot do anything without his permission. That is important to note. The number 1 demographic targeted for recruitment into the life of prostitution is juveniles. If you listen to the studies, it is somewhere between the ages of 12 and 14; the youngest I have seen in my career was 11 years old. I arrested a 12-year-old who propositioned me and spoke to me in a manner you would never believe a 12-year-old could. I was watching her because I thought she was in danger of being approached by a pimp, when she already had been.

These girls go through terrible abuses. Some of the terrible things I have seen are girls being beaten by baseball bats, sodomized with baseball bats, gang-raped by their pimp and his associates. We had a girl who was burnt over 40 percent of her body with a hot iron because she dared to leave her pimp. He kidnapped her, brought her back to his residence, and burnt every tattoo off of her body. We have had girls, the worst-case scenario, taken out into the desert and shot execution style. Terrible things. Beaten and choked with chains, beaten and choked with belts. It is a very violent, racist, sexist subculture.

The reality is that our current pandering statutes do not adequately reflect the appropriate punishment for crimes such as these. For the emotional and physical damage that these victims suffer at the hands of these monsters. A five-year sentence for pandering with force is a cakewalk for these guys. The threat of a four-year sentence without force is a cakewalk. It is becoming popular amongst criminal gangs because they can resell the individual more and more, and because they view selling a human being as low risk, low risk because they are not held in high regard by society in general; low risk because, worst-case scenario, they are going to do five years in prison. Most of the time, if they are convicted at all, they are getting probation.

There is a measure in this bill which is the stipulation that both prosecutor and defense must consent to the waiving of a preliminary hearing. I will give you an example of why that is important to be in this bill. It is very difficult for these victims to come forward in the first place and tell their story. It is difficult for them to trust law enforcement; to trust the judicial system enough to come forward and believe that they will be treated in the right way.

When they finally do get to court, and they have overcome the anxiety and fear they have in testifying against the pimp, they expect to testify at the preliminary hearing. I am relatively certain that the spirit of the defendant being able to waive the preliminary hearing is not so that the defendant can buy himself time to exert pressure on the victim to prevent her from testifying. I can tell you in the last two years we have had a couple of cases where that exact thing has happened. The defendant in a juvenile case had waived his preliminary hearing and from jail orchestrated the luring away of the victim from the home of her mother. Then, with the assistance of the suspect's mother, the victim was taken out of state and held back East to prevent her from testifying against the pimp in his jury trial. Last summer we arrested one of our more notorious pimps, a high-level, extremely violent pimp who had a total of four victims. He orchestrated preventing these victims from testifying after waiving his preliminary hearing by sending out proxies to usher them away as well. He had even tracked down one who had since moved back to the East Coast to prevent her from coming back to testify. When that did not work, he had his family members and proxies come to the courthouse daily to intimidate those victims and to actually try to intimidate the jury as well. He was subsequently convicted. His efforts failed; however, it shows the extent these individuals are willing to go to prevent these people from testifying against them.

I have heard the Attorney General and others talk about how we lack services. Services are lacking; there is no recourse for a victim to get anything back from the pimp in the form of restitution with our current laws. Assembly Bill 67 provides a platform to do that. For those reasons, it is a step in the right direction. I believe it is a huge deterrent and gives the pimps the idea that pimping is not going to be as easy as it currently is.

**Chairman Frierson:**

Are there any questions? I am certain there will be questions when we get into that portion of the bill. I would appreciate it if you will remain available.

**Assemblyman Hansen:**

I was raised in Sparks, and there has always been an atmosphere and belief that "anything goes" in Nevada. One of the most infamous brothels in America is only 12 miles outside of the area where you picked up 55 juveniles. Is there a relationship between the level of street crime we see and our overall tolerance? If I were from out of state, I would have an image of Nevada that "what happens in Vegas stays in Vegas." Is there a relationship or a way to reduce this by having legal prostitution, or is, legal prostitution in fact, causing an expansion of these situations?

**Ron Chalmers:**

What we experience often, especially with our tourist destinations, is that we have a lot of folks who come to Nevada thinking that prostitution is legal because that is what the reputation is. There is an educational component that we in the north have to do aggressively with our tourist base, which is to identify and educate people visiting our community that prostitution is illegal in Reno. I do not think that it deters the street-level prostitution that we see in Reno. An individual who wants to engage in prostitution with regulation and safety can drive 10 minutes down the highway, but they choose not to. They choose to go to Fourth Street, or go online and get a girl. I do think that the legalized prostitution is a deterrent to some degree for those people who wish to have the regulation, but I think it also creates a misconception with some people who visit our state.

**Senator Hutchison:**

I would like to address section 7 of A.B. 67, concerning waiving of the preliminary hearing. In your experience, is what you are describing a typical and routine experience where the pimps are trying to intimidate the victims from testifying, or are you giving us isolated stories? How extensive and how pervasive is the problem and the effort by the pimps to intimidate the victims?

**Donald Hoier:**

The reality is it is happening all the time. It is not an isolated incident. Pimps waive their preliminary hearing, and from that point on, they can essentially drag out the time for the jury trial until one of two things happens. The first is that they get through to the victim that she should not testify, and they use some of the manipulation they have used in the past. Some of them do it aggressively, such as taking the girl out of state or threatening family members. The other part is the emotional attachment. Pimps will normally come at these victims as a boyfriend/girlfriend type of relationship versus a business relationship. They will try to discourage victims from testifying in that way. When that does not work, they can drag it out long enough that the prostitute

gets out of the lifestyle and does not want to come back to revisit it. The short answer to your question is that it is not isolated; it is happening on a regular basis. In my opinion, from what I have seen in my experience of 12 years in dealing with this crime, the main purpose for waiving the preliminary hearing is the victim is there. If the victim is not there, they are willing to go forward with the preliminary hearing so they can get the case thrown out because the state is not ready to proceed.

**Senator Brower:**

I had a chance to work with the Attorney General during the interim on the Advisory Commission on the Administration of Justice. There was a lot of work that went into this bill, and I appreciate everyone being here today. I would also like to thank Ms. Ayoub and Ms. Swanson for sharing their stories with us. Your stories are excellent examples of how those of us who think this could not happen to us are wrong. Those of us in law enforcement bear the burden of perhaps knowing too much about this issue and the realities of this world. I often think that the average Nevadan benefits from being blissfully ignorant about this issue, about the proliferation of child pornography, et cetera.

Mr. Hoier, earlier you used the term "girls" as you were stating your opinion that the vast majority of girls are not willing participants, but that some are. I think you used the term "girls" generically and not to reference the underage victims. It has always seemed to me in prosecuting these cases that when it comes to under aged girls, juveniles, there really is no such thing as voluntary or consent. I hope from the law enforcement perspective you would agree with me that to the extent there may be some willing participants, we are not talking about juveniles.

**Donald Hoier:**

I agree with that 100 percent. I tend to use the term "girls"; I am talking about a demographic that is primarily between the ages of 12 and 25. There are young boys involved in this as well. I am not saying that someone under the age of 18 has the capacity to consent to doing this because they just do not have the wherewithal and life experience to understand the ramifications of what it is that they are doing.

**Chairman Frierson:**

I would like to remind the members that there are certain things that are not before us today, and I do not want the legislative intent to be confused, there is a statute that contemplates non-forceful panderings and this bill leaves those provisions in place.

**Assemblyman Ohrenschall:**

What kind of a safety net is there in either Clark or Washoe County for the victims if they want to try to break free from this cycle? Is there a safe house or a shelter they can go to live in? I imagine most do not have loving, supporting families they can go back to. Is there drug counseling? Is there mental health counseling? What kind of safety net is there to try to catch the victims to get them away from the pimps?

**Ron Chalmers:**

I will be the first to admit that in Washoe County the services are very much lacking. The FBI is the greatest resource we have to provide services for these victims of prostitution who are trying to get out. We have established a relationship with The Courage House in Sacramento, California where they take some of the girls who have a commitment to get out of this lifestyle. It is an excellent program where they provide education and basic life skills such as dietary information. I am currently in the process of working with the representatives in the north, the First Lady of Nevada, and the Children's Cabinet of Nevada to create services for these young victims of prostitution who are trying to seek refuge from this lifestyle. It is a work in progress and as it stands right now, our relations with The Courage House and similar residencies that provide those counseling services are our greatest ally at this time.

**Assemblyman Ohrenschall:**

Some of the victims from Washoe County can live in The Courage House, is that correct?

**Ron Chalmers:**

We have placed at least two in the recent past. The Courage House founders are looking at building a similar home in Reno. By design they want to separate the girls from the area of their victimization. What they would like to do is put the Sacramento girls in the Reno safe house and vice versa, in an effort to create the separation from that lifestyle.

**Donald Hoier:**

Sadly, Clark County is also lacking in services for both adult and juvenile offenders. On the adult side, we do have the ability to place temporarily in safe houses. We have The Shade Tree and a couple of safe houses we utilize until we can make arrangements for them to get to where they want to go. We do not have any long-term locations for juveniles where they can be housed while they receive care. I believe Judge William Voy has taken the lead to try to solve that problem in Clark County.



**Assemblyman Martin:**

Are there hotlines posted, plastered, and otherwise distributed? Unfortunately it is a foregone conclusion that most of these kids probably have cell phones, and if they are in trouble and they happen to come across a number, they can call for help. Does this type of number exist, and if not, do you think it would be a value in helping bringing these children in and let them know that this is a safe number to call?

**Ron Chalmers:**

The Polaris Project posts an 800 number. Through the process of A.B. 67, the Attorney General's Office and the Reno Police Department explored having that number posted on some of the websites we discussed earlier. We found out that it is posted, but it is in extremely fine print. There is also a safe number run by the Polaris Project where they will notify law enforcement in the correct jurisdiction, and law enforcement can respond and assist to provide services for those individuals looking to escape.

**Chairman Frierson:**

Are there any other questions? Seeing none, I would like now to review the language of the bill.

**Catherine Cortez Masto:**

Judge Voy is in Las Vegas and he would like to speak to this bill.

**William O. Voy, Judge, Eighth Judicial District:**

I was here yesterday morning, alone, testifying. Behind me today it is standing room only. It appears to be similar in Carson City. I would suggest this is not a growing problem, but is now being documented and coming to the surface. Society has opened up its collective eyes, just like we saw with domestic violence in the early '70s. This is a problem that society has not dealt with. It was brought out to the light, and now what do we do with it? We have a lot of people here who want to help with this population.

My comments are directed to the sex-exploited youth, whom I have jurisdiction over and am trying to help in my role as a juvenile court judge. There are faith-based communities and non-faith-based communities, both wanting to help this population of victims. What we are seriously lacking in is the government portion. Every judicial officer in the State of Nevada has to do mandatory domestic violence training so they are sensitive to those issues. I suggest that in order to deal with this issue, to have a chance to fight against it and save these children, you will need to have similar systems and efforts in place or you

will not be successful. From what I have seen over the last nine years in dealing with this population, you can be successful.

Assembly Bill 67 is heavy in punishment and in prosecution. We need more emphasis on services, intervention, prevention, and education. I am not here to express an opinion as to length of sentence or types of crimes. That is not my role as district court judge. I am here to talk about the service end of things.

In regard to sections 7 through 10 of A.B. 76, waiving a preliminary hearing, I experience that on a weekly basis. I am the one that law enforcement and prosecution comes to see to do a material witness hold, to hold the kid in detention while waiting to testify at the preliminary hearing and to preserve that testimony at trial. I am holding this child in detention while the pimp is out on bond. This child, because of being a flight risk, is sitting in detention waiting to testify. What kind of witness is that going to make? The next time law enforcement encounters this young lady and they want her cooperation, knowing what happened to her the last time, do you think she is going to cooperate? Probably not. I have seen it happen. That one portion of this bill, as it relates to the protection of the children under my care, is the most important. I do not care what you put on paper as far as length of sentence, or if they have to register as a sex offender; unless you get a successful prosecution, you will never get to that point.

One of the things we came across early on in our efforts in dealing with this population was that safe house, a controlled therapeutic setting where the children could not run from. We devised that for two goals. One is to help these children. Two is to allow prosecution and Vice to work with those young ladies and boys in a safe therapeutic environment to develop testimony and prosecutions against the perpetrators.

In closing, I am here to answer any questions. I also have many horror stories. I do not want you to forget that we are dealing with our kids. When we first started, 70 percent of the kids were brought from other jurisdictions into Las Vegas. That pendulum has swung. It is now reversed and 70 percent of the kids coming before me are from our communities. These are our children being victimized in our community. It is about time that we, collectively, do something about it.

**Catherine Cortez Masto:**

You have heard from some of the many workers here. I would now like to get into the specifics of A.B. 67. This does not impact the brothel industry in this state. This has nothing with the statutes or laws addressing the brothel

industry and the legalization of them in certain cities and counties. This was a bill put together based on all the things we were hearing. You have heard some of it today; however, we will take some of the sections out of order because it makes sense to do it that way.

**Michon A. Martin, Chief Deputy Attorney General, Bureau of Litigation, Public Safety Division, Office of the Attorney General:**

I have spoken to many of you about this bill, and I want to make sure that we understand what we are trying to do. You have heard from many of the voices that have partnered with us on this bill to try to make it the most effective bill it can be for Nevada, so it works here, with law enforcement, prosecutors, defense attorneys, and service providers all weighing in. We have also partnered with the Polaris Project, which is an organization committed to ending this form of modern-day slavery. They have assisted three-quarters of the states in drafting legislation and passing laws that effectively combat human trafficking. They state that you need a holistic approach. That is what all of you have heard today. We have the prosecution piece to prevent further victimization and prevent further victims. We also have the services. This is just our first piece.

We looked at all the other states to see what their laws are and to see what worked and, as importantly, what did not work. We found that there are some states that created a whole new crime called human trafficking. California did that; it was enacted in 2005 and has been used only one time and never used again. So, that is not something that works. We looked at what laws we have on the books. We looked at the pandering statute and used it as our framework. Much of that statute has not been touched since 1913. It is a very antiquated statute using phrases like "chaste character" and "houses of ill repute"; terms that most people do not understand.

I was a prosecutor for over a decade, and I specialized in cases involving women and children. These are the most difficult cases to prosecute because these women and children are broken in a way that I have never seen; not in rape cases and not in child sexual-assault cases because most of these victims were victimized before. These pimps have become so sophisticated in their ability to groom. This is a marriage between domestic violence and child sexual assault. The most horrible marriage there could be.

Everyone has indicated the law has to change. Forty-three states have changed their laws to mirror what we are trying to do today. Those states used the federal definition of sex trafficking, which is what we are intending to do here.

Those laws have been tested, and we will all be speaking the same language, and we are casting a net that is capturing how this crime has evolved.

The definition of sex trafficking from the Department of Justice is what we are putting into that pandering statute, so that it will become the sex-trafficking statute. With an adult victim there is force, violence, intimidation, and coercion. All of those are required elements of sex trafficking. For our children, force and violence is not required in the way we drafted the sex-trafficking statute. That is very important for prosecutions. The pimps will tell the children they love them and ask them to do a favor. There would not necessarily be violence, so we could not capture that conduct. Again, we are evolving and modernizing to be able to capture the conduct as it currently exists.

One of the biggest issues is the need to increase penalties. I know that makes some folks nervous, so we were very careful in the way we worked through this. We took a hard look at what other laws and penalties are, and we also looked at what the existing pandering statute does. Currently, the existing pandering statute for trafficking an adult is one to four or five years in prison. Almost everyone gets probation. That is a revolving door for the perpetrators. They get out of custody and start recruiting our children, our women, and our men. We decided to go up only one sentencing level. We are being careful in the way we are doing this, so pandering is going from a category C to a B felony in the context of an adult. With no violence and no threat of violence, then it is a category C felony.

When it comes to our children, everyone feels differently. When we looked at that sentencing structure, we were very careful going up one sentencing level from a B to an A. But, what this crime actually is, when those pimps are choosing to traffic our children, they themselves are aiding and abetting the rape or sexual assault of that child. In most circumstances, the pimp is the first one to have sex with that child. When we look at sexual assault in Nevada, those penalties are category A felonies. Kidnapping of a child is an A felony. All of that has a similar feel to this. That is why it is so important that these crimes also are A felonies, and depending on the age of the victim, that is 10 years to life, or 15 years to life. Another piece for our children is that probation is not available. Again, you can see why that would be important. If we put one perpetrator in prison for life, that is saving a generation of victims.

Also in this bill is sex-offender registration. From a policy standpoint, the intent of this is a notice issue for the community. We want the community to know who lives near them, if a rapist lives next door or a pedophile around the corner. Given how these perpetrators operate, we also want to know whether a pimp or

sex trafficker lives down the street, so we can protect our own. It is important to know where these people are so the community can be prepared also.

Another piece of the bill is looking at the demand. It has been so important with all the partners we have spoken to that the demand portion of this will make a difference. The holistic approach to effectively combatting human trafficking includes that piece. The sex-trafficking piece would apply to the customer of a prostitute in limited circumstances. For example, if a customer is using force, violence, or threats, then that is considered sex trafficking. If that customer is interested in soliciting our children, then that person is considered in sex trafficking.

Other pieces of this bill are regarding the evolution of this crime in that gangs have gotten into the business. We have put sex trafficking into the racketeering statutes and into the conspiracy statutes. So if gangs are in the business of trafficking our kids, women, and men, then we can effectively prosecute the entire gang.

Law enforcement also talked about the ability to wiretap. I will tell you as a prosecutor, it is very difficult to ever get a wiretap authorized. In those limited circumstances, where it is authorized, there can be no better evidence for a prosecution. If there is a tip of young girls being run out of a hotel, and a wiretap is authorized, then all the evidence is caught on tape, a very powerful tool when addressing the prosecution piece to protect all of those future victims.

**Catherine Cortez Masto:**

Section 41 of A.B. 67 addresses the initial piece which is where we codify the sex-trafficking language and why the penalties are so important. We make a distinction between an adult and a child.

**Michon Martin:**

Section 41 gives us definition so we all understand what we are trying to capture. There are definitions for an "adult," a "child," "induce," and "prostitution." It states, "'Prostitution' means engaging in, agreeing or offering to engage in sexual conduct with another person in return for a fee, monetary consideration or other thing of value." This crime has evolved, and the perpetrators will buy clothes for the victim, get their hair and nails done for them; these are things of value. Customers do the same thing, buying things in exchange for the sexual conduct. We also define sexual conduct to have a very broad definition to ensure we are capturing all potential conduct to better protect our victims.

**Chairman Frierson:**

Concerns have been raised to me about the broadening of the definition of prostitution to include, for example, where a spouse may say there will be no sexual activity unless you get my nails done or take me on a trip. The purist in me that looks at word by word of the statutes looks at how broad it is and how that could apply to nonpandering or nontrafficking situations. Short of the standard prosecutory discretion, how are we making sure this language focuses on illegal activity?

**Michon Martin:**

Under those circumstances you mentioned, there would have to be force, violence, or coercion along with the scenario you provided for it to be in the realm of sex trafficking. With all of those requirements, this would take it outside the realm of a marital dispute; it then becomes an issue of the trafficking of our victims.

**Catherine Cortez Masto:**

Are you concerned with page 28, line 6, "other thing of value?"

**Chairman Frierson:**

That is correct. The definition of induce means to persuade, encourage, inveigle, or entice. There is no indication that force is required. That raises another point, can you clarify that force is required? Also can you clarify so that we have a record of legislative intent that not all circumstances are intended to be considered forceful?

**Michon Martin:**

Section 41 is just definitions, not the elements of the crime. Section 42, which is the sex-trafficking statute, shows what elements must be proven beyond a reasonable doubt for the crime to be committed. Section 42, subsection 1, paragraph (b) states, "Induces recruits, harbors, transports, provides, obtains or maintains a person by any means, knowing or in reckless disregard of the fact, that threats, violence, force, intimidation, fraud, duress or coercion will be used to cause the person to engage in prostitution, or to enter any place within this State in which prostitution is practiced . . . ." It is very clear that to be in the world of sex trafficking and to be convicted of that crime, at least one piece of force, violence, or intimidation must occur.

**Senator Ford:**

Do you think some of the amendments that have been offered to section 42 are insufficient for the purposes that you are trying to get passed? Have you

considered the amendments that have been offered by the Clark and Washoe County Public Defender's Offices ([Exhibit F](#)) relative to section 42?

**Catherine Cortez Masto:**

Will you identify those amendments? We will be happy to address them.

**Senator Ford:**

One of the amendments ([Exhibit F](#)) looks to change section 42, subsection 2, paragraph (a), which is a person who is found guilty of pandering. It lays out the actual punishment for the crime of which he has been found guilty. It states "for a first offense, of a category C felony and shall be punished as provided in NRS 193.130, and for any subsequent offense, of a category B felony, and shall be punished by imprisonment in the state prison for a minimum term of 2 years and a maximum term of 15 years, and may be further punished by a fine of not more than \$20,000." There are additional suggestions in terms of the amendment, but I am wondering if you have given any consideration to those amendments to see if they would be sufficient for the purposes of this statute.

**Catherine Cortez Masto:**

Of course we will give consideration to everyone's concerns and have an open dialogue. My only concern is that it does not address what you just heard from law enforcement, which is the reason why we need the stronger penalties and deterrents. More importantly, the penalties that we have put in are consistent with other similarly situated crimes such as rape and sexual assault. If we are really going to treat this as a serious crime, then it requires a serious penalty. From our perspective, if we are dealing with our children or someone who is forced to have sex with man after man, that is a serious issue and requires a strong penalty for the deterrent. As you heard from law enforcement, there is a collateral benefit to that deterrent in helping the victim in working through not only the prosecutions, but the needs that the victims have when it comes to their services.

**Senator Ford:**

Specific to something that one of the detectives said earlier about offenders being put on probation for their offenses, it appears to me that one amendment ([Exhibit F](#)) addresses that. On page 3 it states that, "A court shall not grant probation to or suspend the sentence of a person convicted of pandering a child pursuant to this section." Would that satisfy the concern of making certain some of these individuals do not walk out the door when they have been found guilty?

**Michon Martin:**

That is also in A.B. 67; there is no probation available if convicted of sex trafficking a child.

We talked to all of our partners on the protection of victims. You have heard how important that piece is. One of those important pieces is asset forfeiture. Asset forfeiture is in section 11 through section 21. The intention is that assets are able to be frozen early on, so at the filing of the complaint, the assets can be frozen. What we have seen historically is that the perpetrator may have wads of cash, cars, or property, but he has been very good anecdotally at hiding the assets. We want to make sure to include a process for the court to make findings. There is a hearing to determine the assets are in fact the proceeds of the criminal enterprise, so that we can ensure we are looking only at the assets to be frozen and potentially forfeited and liquidated that were part of the crime itself. Within those asset forfeiture provisions, which already occur in Nevada law, if those assets are liquidated, they go first to the claimant, so in this case it would go to the victim. That is the way existing Nevada law reads in any other asset forfeiture provisions.

There is a piece of this bill that requires mandatory restitution. The intention of restitution is to make the victim whole. We cannot make the victim whole, but we can give them a start at getting out of this world and becoming self-actualized. This will give the court wide discretion in assessing mandatory restitution. There are all sorts of pieces the court could look at. The value of these services, for example, how much the defendant made off of the victims, or any other appropriate means. There is no one in a better position than the court or a jury listening to this trial to be able to actually understand what happened to this victim in this circumstance, then an award is made for mandatory restitution; a civil cause of action for victims of human trafficking and sex trafficking.

**Chairman Frierson:**

Section 16 references property that was used or was intended to be used. If property was purchased before there was illegal activity, for example, if an individual owns a house, what is the connection to illegal behavior? How would you incorporate "intended to use" without violating any individual property rights that were not used for illegal activity?

**Michon Martin:**

There are a few circumstances that come readily to mind; the purchasing of a car. I will say anecdotally what we are seeing in northern Nevada are the sex-trafficking establishments popping up in cul-de-sacs in our neighborhoods,



where there is a house being used for that purpose. Where there are mattresses being taken in, swamp coolers being placed in the house, et cetera, before the activity begins. I think there are circumstances like that, where specifically something is being purchased for use in sex trafficking. I agree, just because they have a house does not mean that it is part and parcel of the sex trafficking. I think it is specific as to the facts, and that is why we want to ensure the court is taking a hard look at this, and that there is a hearing to go through all of those pieces.

**Chairman Frierson:**

I am wondering, if rather than "intending to be used," if "purchased for the intention to use" might satisfy that need so that we clarify if they had it and used it or purchased it clearly for the purpose of using it.

On page 11, section 16, subsection 4, I am confused about how to forfeit or estimate the value of property that cannot be located. I believe the intention is to give the court broad discretion to consider anything applicable in awarding restitution, but this seems to be very vague. I am concerned if we need that wording or leave it open for the court to consider anything applicable for restitution.

**Michon Martin:**

I appreciate that you are very careful with these words. Historically these assets have been hidden. These perpetrators are very good at hiding assets so that they are outside the reach of any asset forfeiture provision. For example, there may be evidence in the record that these girls were being transported by their pimp back and forth from a hotel or delivered to various locations in a black Suburban registered to the perpetrator, but we cannot not find it. So giving broad discretion to the court is what is intended. If there is language to clarify that intent, we would be happy to look at it.

**Chairman Frierson:**

I believe in the civil portion of this bill there is a catchall, but I certainly think it is warranted to allow the court to consider as many factors as possible that are relevant to the underlying behavior.

**Assemblywoman Spiegel:**

In section 21, what happens if there are multiple jurisdictions involved, including multiple states?

**Michon Martin:**

We have a section that addresses the continuing course of conduct, so there could be a prosecution involving many jurisdictions. The court would be best to handle how to process that. We would have the same hearing if it was Nevada property, and we would have to do the same thing for any property that is looking to be forfeited and then liquidated.

**Senator Hammond:**

I would like to address asset forfeitures. The broader problem with sex trafficking is that we are talking about gangs being involved, large groups of people. You mentioned the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations (RICO) laws. I am wondering if we are going to get to the bottom of the intent of the law. Is it the bill's intent to not only go after the one vehicle that may have been used, but when you are looking at asset forfeitures, you are talking about going after everything that this gang may possess in order to run their sex trafficking business. Is that correct?

**Michon Martin:**

That is correct. The prosecutor could have the discretion if they wanted to proceed under the RICO statutes, or conspiracy statutes, as well as sex trafficking. Yes, they would look at the asset forfeiture for that gang, for all of the defendants that are included in the criminal prosecution. Potentially the court could be seizing a large amount of assets.

**Chairman Frierson:**

Section 16 mentions a jury. Would a jury determine restitution amounts in criminal cases, or would the provisions regarding forfeiture be more appropriate for the judge to determine restitution?

**Michon Martin:**

For ordering restitution, the court has the bird's-eye view and orders restitution. For the asset forfeiture, it can be a jury that also looks at the assets. The way this bill is currently drafted, it includes the ability for objective viewers to look at this and see the subject of the criminal enterprise. States do this as a criminal proceeding as well as a civil proceeding. In Nevada there are also civil proceedings available for asset forfeiture.

**Assemblywoman Fiore:**

I have property, and I do not know my tenant or his occupation other than what was listed on the lease. If he is a pimp and gets arrested, what happens to my house?

**Michon Martin:**

That is why we wanted to make sure this process is included, so we do not capture those assets. That is not something we are looking to seize and liquidate. Especially with a landlord/tenant relationship, the landlord has no idea that this is happening. I cannot imagine a situation where the prosecutor would try to seize the house. The hearing would go through all of those pieces.

**Assemblyman Carrillo:**

Page 6, line 25, states "mentally retarded." Senate Bill No. 149 of the 76th Session was passed regarding Rosa's Law. Instead of using "mentally retarded," it should read "intellectual disability." I would like to see that amended.

**Michon Martin:**

That was the original language, but yes, we will change that.

I would like to discuss the preservation of the testimony piece of A.B. 67 because we have heard concerns from some Committee members. Sections 7 through 10 discuss the intention of giving the state a right to a preliminary hearing. You heard testimony about why this is important. Again, that is what happens in these prosecutions. Preliminary hearings are a statutory right, not a constitutional right; there are no constitutional implications to this piece. We usually have victims for a very limited amount of time. The victim is ready to walk into court, is ready to testify, having gone through so much to be brave enough to walk into the courtroom, and then the preliminary hearing is waived strategically by the defendant. It is then set for trial, oftentimes a year or two down the line. We no longer have the victim, and there is no prosecution. It is exceedingly important that we give the state the right to a preliminary hearing so they have the ability to preserve that testimony at that time, in the court proceeding they have prepared for.

We want to ensure we are addressing concerns and trying to make sure that this bill is as concise and as good a bill as we can make it. For the record, the way this bill is drafted now, it is broadly applicable, it could work in a sexual assault case, in a domestic violence case, and in other cases. I think that was the concern with the Committee, we certainly heard from some justices of the peace, they thought that might be too broad. I think we need to limit that section so that it just applies to cases of sex trafficking which would allay the concerns of the Committee.

**Chairman Frierson:**

A preliminary hearing is scheduled within 15 days, and oftentimes, because the attorney for the defendant is not privy to all of the discovery, they will waive the hearing so as not to hold everything up and prepare for trial. That way the defendant can get all the information and have a meaningful cross-examination. I am wondering about the option of a deposition, which is rarely done in criminal cases, and whether or not that is an opportunity to preserve testimony in what seems to me to be a much less intimidating environment than coming to justice court for a preliminary hearing.

**James R. Sweetin, Chief Deputy District Attorney, Clark County Office of the District Attorney:**

I am currently in charge of the special victims unit within the office which prosecutes sexually-motivated crimes as well as crimes involving children. I have conducted depositions in various crimes and preserving evidence, but never in regards to a case of sex trafficking. The reason is that it just does not fit as it has been laid out. I would like to reiterate the importance of this piece of legislation.

In regard to the depositions, there are provisions made in the statutes for depositions, both video and otherwise to be taken. It is discretionary with the court and there has to be a showing made before the deposition can be taken. These depositions are most often seen taken in cases where a victim is infirm or elderly, and there is concern that the victim may not be alive at the time that his testimony is needed. In these particular cases, the state cannot make a showing that is required under the statute of good cause that the witness will be unable to attend or prevented from attending a trial or a hearing. The reason we believe the victim is at risk is because of all the reasons you have heard here today. We know from experience that these victims are not around at the time they are needed to testify in most cases. If we do not get their testimony locked in initially, at the time they are in custody and most conducive and agreeable to prosecuting the case, it is very difficult to get it. Basically, we cannot say to the court that we think, because of the nature of this case, that this witness is not going to be available. We have tried it. We had a circumstance where we had a very prolific pimp who in fact had dissuaded witnesses in the past. Now we have a subsequent case with the same pimp, we go to the court and say he has a history of dissuading witnesses and we are afraid that will happen in this case as well. We have not been successful. I do not know of one case in Clark County in which we have been able to preserve testimony in these cases.

I would also like to make another point; what happens if the testimony is not preserved? I will tell you, in these types of cases in Clark County, approximately three-quarters of the cases that we prosecute, when they come up to preliminary hearing, the preliminary hearing is waived so that we cannot preserve the testimony. When that happens, some of these cases are dismissed as they come up to trial. I have tried to check the statistics in our jurisdiction, and it appears that it is approximately 15 percent of the cases. For the most part, this affects the playing field for all of these cases. In essence, when we have this scenario of the unknown or the likelihood that the victim might not appear, when it comes to negotiating these cases, we negotiate them at a greatly reduced offense or penalty. Either way, justice is not done.

I would submit to you that if the state did have the statutory opportunity to preserve the testimony through a preliminary hearing just as the defense does, many more cases would be resolved at the preliminary hearing level. They would not go up to district court and languish through the process of discovery, the process of legal motions, or the process of evidentiary hearings. The reason for that is negotiations are driven by unknowns. In cases like this, the greatest unknown is whether or not the victim is going to be available to testify and whether the testimony is preserved. Once that unknown is gone and we have testimony from the victim, we know that piece is there, these cases are most likely going to have a reasonable negotiation; reasonable to the defendant, reasonable to the people of the State of Nevada, and justice will be done. The solution to the problem is very simple: give the State the same statutory right that the defense has. In regard to the preliminary hearing and the discovery is not available, these are not complicated paper cases where there is a huge amount of discovery coming in. The discovery in these cases, many times, is the same discovery at the preliminary hearing which the defense gets prior to the hearing. It is a very unusual circumstance when that lack of discovery is the reason. Normally these cases are continued or waived not to make the case go faster, but to not allow the state to preserve the testimony so that ultimately the defendant might garner a better negotiation or even dismissal of the case.

**Chairman Frierson:**

We visited the discovery before preliminary issue last session. My recollection is that a defendant is not entitled to all discovery prior to preliminary hearing, and it was only two years ago that the defendant was entitled to get discovery before preliminary hearing that was in the possession of the State. That means if the investigating agency has discovery, the defendant is not necessarily privy to it at preliminary hearing. It is not until they get ready for trial that the defendant has access to that information. In practice, oftentimes the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department does not have time to compile the report and

get to the prosecutor within 15 days, so that it would not hold up the process. It seems to me there is a great deal of discovery that is not available at preliminary hearing, so everyone does not necessarily have the same information. I have been told in Washoe County, they actually file complaints based on an affidavit from a police officer before they get the actual police report.

**James Sweetin:**

That is correct at the preliminary hearing stage, since it is a showing of probable cause, not a full trial. The courts have determined that preliminary hearings are not a point where full discovery has to be provided. In Clark County, we do have an open file policy in which all discovery that the State has is turned over to the defense, which is normally all the discovery in the case prior to preliminary hearing in sex-trafficking cases.

**Senator Segerblom:**

Are you saying that the testimony from the preliminary hearing is admissible to the jury?

**James Sweetin:**

That is correct. Once testimony is preserved through a preliminary hearing, if the victim is unavailable or unable to attend the trial, that testimony can be used.

**Senator Segerblom:**

Is it read into the record or is it videotaped?

**James Sweetin:**

It depends; it is a practical matter. In some courtrooms we are able to videotape the testimony and preserve it in that manner. At any rate, all of the justice courts are courts of record, and there is a transcript made of the proceedings that can be read into the record.

**Chairman Frierson:**

Would clarifying the law in respect to depositions help your position? For example, clarifying that in those circumstances a deposition could be taken and be admissible in the furtherance of being able to preserve testimony.

**James Sweetin:**

As you have heard from the testimony today, the victims are unique and so horribly affected by these crimes. It is my belief that the most simple, most judicious, and most efficient manner of seeking justice in these matters would

be to give the State the same right as the defense, which is the right to a preliminary hearing to preserve testimony. There have been comments regarding the burden this might place on the system; I do not see that. We have 18 justice courts in the greater Las Vegas area. On any given day, each of those courts probably has 20 preliminary hearings on the calendar. The issue of sex trafficking in Las Vegas is a great one. We have very limited resources in regard to what the police can and cannot do. On average, our office will get about 10 to 15 cases each month for prosecution in regard to pandering. That would not be a great burden to put on a short preliminary hearing to preserve testimony. The benefit would be great. I think this would cause a greater negotiation of cases early on and take the burden off the system in district courts.

**Assemblyman Ohrenschall:**

Have many judges refused a request to depose the victim?

**James Sweetin:**

We have attempted; however, I do not know of one case in Clark County where we have been successful in preserving testimony of a victim of sex trafficking through use of the deposition statutes.

**Assemblyman Ohrenschall:**

There has been much testimony today about trying to put a barrier between the alleged pimp and the victims. Would it not be easier on the victim to depose them not in the presence of the accused pimp, as opposed to forcing the preliminary hearing to go forward and making the victim speak with all that pressure of a justice courtroom with the alleged pimp there?

**James Sweetin:**

In order for the preserved testimony to be used at a later jury trial, it must meet all constitutional requirements. One constitutional requirement is the right of confrontation. The defendant in the case would have the right to confront the victim under any scenario.

**Assemblyman Ohrenschall:**

Would there be some way, as you do with child victims, of getting this information, perhaps an alternative to the preliminary hearing?

**James Sweetin:**

The courts have made very clear that the right of confrontation is something that we cannot play with. We do prosecute a number of cases involving child victims, both sex trafficking as well as other crimes. Sadly enough, the child

does have to come into court and testify, both at the preliminary hearings and ultimately at trial.

**Senator Ford:**

I do not practice in criminal arena; I have a civil practice. I do have a rudimentary recollection of confrontation issues. Do we have legal case law that supports whether or not the cross-examination opportunity at a preliminary hearing is sufficient for purposes of constitutionally adequate cross-examination? If it is going to be used at trial, early in the case you do not have all the evidence, oftentimes, one of the first times that the public defender gets to meet the defendant is at the preliminary hearing. Is that going to be constitutionally sufficient for purposes of confrontation?

**James Sweetin:**

There is case law that provides us with our answer to that; yes, it is sufficient. In practice, I have not known a situation where an attorney shows up at the preliminary hearing and begins putting on evidence. There is preparation that happens, and if there is not adequate time for that preparation, the courts give deference to the defense.

**Assemblyman Duncan:**

Section 7 of A.B. 67 changes the analysis of witness unavailability pursuant to the rules of evidence. Is that the intent of section 7?

**James Sweetin:**

There are statutory provisions that provide for when a witness is unavailable to testify. Certainly, in my understanding of the statutory framework, A.B. 67 would not, in any way, change that.

**Senator Brower:**

For the benefit of those who have not been at a preliminary hearing, will you give a brief summary of how it works, who is there, and maybe enhance the comfort level of some of the Committee members as to what rights the defendant does have in a preliminary hearing?

**James Sweetin:**

The preliminary hearing is very similar to a trial with respect to the people that are present. At the preliminary hearing, the prosecutor is present, as are the defense attorney, his client, and the judge who presides over the hearing. Witnesses are called as they would be in a trial. The rules of evidence prevail. Objections can be made and the court rules on them. It is very similar to a trial.



**Senator Brower:**

The outcome in terms of the government's goal is a probable cause finding, and that the case be bound over for trial, as opposed to guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. Beyond that, everything else is the same, the defendant has a chance to cross-examine the witnesses, as he would at trial, correct?

**James Sweetin:**

That is correct.

**Senator Hutchison:**

Section 7 is going to be the challenging section of this bill. The defense bar has stated that this is going to be "the hill they die on." It is very important to them. One of the challenges I have heard is that this is going to fundamentally change what we have known for decades in terms of preliminary hearings. While sex trafficking is tragic and serious, there are many other very serious and tragic crimes as well. I wonder why we may need to fundamentally change this preliminary hearing aspect for this type of crime, if, in doing so, it is going to have the type of serious impact that the defense bar is concerned with.

**Catherine Cortez Masto:**

I am working with the defense bar, and I absolutely understand their concerns, which is why we are willing to narrow this to just this specific crime. This is going to change the way business has been done in this state with respect to preliminary hearings. We think it is important to have this tool when it comes to sex trafficking for the very reasons that you have heard. Quite often we have seen pimps trying to delay the process so they can circumvent, circle around back to the victim and get the victim to recant, or threaten the victim from testifying. If we do not have the victim, particularly when it comes to juveniles, we cannot prosecute the case. If we are not prosecuting and putting these pimps away, they will be preying on our kids and on adults who are victims of sex trafficking. That is why we felt it is such an important issue to bring it forth in this particular arena.

**Senator Hutchison:**

We know that much of this legislation has been patterned from the federal legislation. What happens in the federal system? Is there a pattern we can follow concerning any kind of preliminary hearings?

**Catherine Cortez Masto:**

I can tell you from my experience, the process is a little different. Hearsay activity is allowed at the federal level and not in this State. We are mirroring the sex-trafficking laws at the federal level, how they are prosecuted at the

federal level. Unfortunately there is so much sex trafficking going on in our state that we want to ensure we have the tools at the state and local level for our local law enforcement to inhibit this type of activity.

**Senator Hutchison:**

If we determine that preserving testimony by way of videotaping and having both the accused and counsel present, because of the confrontation clause, and judges are not granting this type of videotaped depositions, can we, as a legislature, tell the judge to do it? We are saying a presumption should exist that in sex-trafficking cases that good cause exists for the preservation of testimony.

**Catherine Cortez Masto:**

I would never presume to tell the judges what they should or should not do. If there is some sort of mandate, it would be an unfunded mandate. There would need to be a significant fiscal note attached to the bill because of the concern of more work they would have to do as a result.

**Chairman Frierson:**

The purpose of a preliminary hearing is essentially to screen cases so that the court can either determine there is not sufficient evidence to go forward, or to facilitate resolving a case before it goes to district court and a jury. Is that an accurate statement?

**James Sweetin:**

That is correct. It is a step that the legislature has created in the process. The state has to make a showing of at least probable cause before it goes forward to a higher court and goes through the arduous process of preparing for and ultimately trying the case.

**Michon Martin:**

The last few sections of A.B. 67 are a product of what Senator Wiener did in her Legislative Committee on Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice. Recommendations came from that committee to treat our victims of sex trafficking the same way we treat our victims of sexual assault, to give them the same dignity and respect. We included sex-trafficking victims within the rape shield laws, in section 2. We have also included treating our sex-trafficking victims as we do sexual-assault victims when it comes to statute of limitations in sections 4, 5 and 6. Again we make sure we are providing the same dignity and respect to these victims by providing confidentiality in sections 37, 38, and 39. For example, if I was sex trafficked, it would not say in the complaint Michon Martin was sex trafficked for all the world to know.

This provides confidentiality and gives the victim the ability to have a pseudonym. The last piece that came out of Senator Wiener's committee is ensuring that aid in certain circumstances is available to victims of sex trafficking as well, which is in section 51.

**Senator Segerblom:**

I have a question regarding the sex offender registry. Is there an average age for panderers?

**Michon Martin:**

I do not believe there is an average for the perpetrators. When we talk about sex offender registration, most important is the notice to the community, making sure they understand who is living in their community, and where they are living so they can protect their children and their loved ones.

**Senator Segerblom:**

Is it your understanding that the perpetrators do this for a lifetime?

**Michon Martin:**

I do not want to overreach. I can say anecdotally, what we are seeing is pimps or perpetrators getting out of prison, and yes, they go right back on the streets. Andrea Swanson gave you an example of that today when she said that she had her daughter for 2 1/2 years, which was still not long enough. The second the pimp was released from prison, they were back together.

**Senator Segerblom:**

So you want the perpetrator to be a Tier III offender, which is lifetime supervision, which is obviously very costly to the State. Is there some point where it may not be necessary to make them a Tier III?

**Chairman Frierson:**

I would like to go through a few concerns about restitution in general. It appears to me that the restitution provisions do some pretty unconventional things. One is that pain and suffering as part of a criminal restitution order are typically more articulable costs. While that could be put in the civil portion, putting it in a criminal restitution order seems to be different. Regarding forfeiture measures, there have been concerns regarding notice and property rights for those that are not the actors. For example, if there is a home involved and there would be a forfeiture on the sale of the home, the municipality that facilitated the forfeiture and sale would not get paid for expenses before the victim, despite the fact there would not be any money unless they did the sale.

I am also concerned about the insinuation that banks would not get paid until after the victim. So, a \$300,000 house is sold, and the banks would only get what is left over after the victim is paid. There are concerns about that process, especially with the bills we have dealing with foreclosures. This strikes me as odd that this would not affect banks and lenders who obviously have nothing to do with the underlying behavior.

I agree that there is a need for the court to have broad discretion to make these victims as whole as possible and to put them on a path of being able to overcome this experience and being productive, safe, and healthy. I am wondering if some of that should be broadened to allow the court to consider it without expressly putting it in statute, because there are so many different situations. I have concerns about narrowing it in this way instead of leaving it to the court to order restitution in a way they see is appropriate and applicable to that individual set of circumstances.

**Michon Martin:**

Again, thank you for looking at the particular language to ensure it is working for us. The way it is intended for the victim claimant to be paid restitution first, that is how it currently exists under Nevada law, with asset forfeiture, that the claimant is paid first, then the state is paid. We tried to mirror existing law.

Mandatory restitution in this area is because it is such a unique crime. For example, if the victim is deceased, if she had children, they would also potentially receive that money so they can move on with their lives. What we are seeing in both the labor trafficking and sex trafficking is that it impacts the family. When we give all of these different ways in which the court can look at it, the intent of the statute is to make it very broad and give discretion. It is not that we are requiring the court to do every piece of the restitution; it is just what they can look at and then determine under those circumstances.

**Chairman Frierson:**

One of the questions I have received is the provisions regarding the district attorney being able to agree to allow the Attorney General to prosecute those cases. It was my understanding that was already the law, that the prosecutor could prosecute it, or if the DA decided not to, then the Attorney General could.

**Michon Martin:**

Yes, the Attorney General's Office has executive jurisdiction, but historically, we have not relied on that. We have, like in the elder abuse cases, created concurrent jurisdiction to the Attorney General with counties. We are attempting to do the same thing here, which we modeled after the elder abuse

piece so that we can help in this field. It is not the intention that the Attorney General will now handle all of these cases statewide; it is just to help. For example, if a rural county has a very difficult case, we can assist in that area. If we wanted to collaborate with another state on a continuing course of conduct, we could do that.

**Catherine Cortez Masto:**

I would like to add that you may or may not be familiar with the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. They have a site in every state. Nevada is unique in that we actually house the individual who handles the Nevada Clearinghouse for Missing and Exploited Children issues in my office. We have an investigator and a prosecutor who are working on these issues. We have the authority to address the missing piece, and we investigate and prosecute for missing children when they are kidnapped. This bill brings the exploited piece back into my office and ensures that everyone has an understanding of what we are doing as well. It is not my goal to take primary jurisdiction away from the district attorneys on this subject. Just the opposite, we are there to support. More importantly, in many of our rural communities, the district attorneys do not have a lot of resources. Quite often my prosecutors and my investigators will support the district attorneys and the law enforcement in the rural communities where they are challenged with resources.

**Chairman Frierson:**

If you have a victim of human trafficking that is in the system, and grows up in the system, and becomes a first-line supervisor of another victim of human trafficking, is that person subject to prosecution for human trafficking, or is she considered a victim?

**Catherine Cortez Masto:**

Do we treat them as victims? It sounds like we should because they were forced into the prostitution arena. Should we prosecute them and stop them from preying on other girls? That is an issue we will need to solve as a community. I do not have an answer. As prosecutors, as compassionate advocates for treatment, our goal is to help the victims and put away those perpetrators who want to continue to prey on them. When we come across the first-line supervisors, it will have to be handled on a case-by-case basis where we will have to work with them and figure out how to address their needs. That comes to the piece of more services and more professionals who can help these girls that are falling into this trade. That is our challenge moving forward. Along with that is the education, the awareness piece; it is having a hotline, talking about this issue, having joint meetings, and making people aware of this issue and what occurs. So, yes it is an issue that we need to address

compassionately, but we also need to keep in mind the deterrent component of what we are trying to achieve.

**Senator Segerblom:**

One of the concerns I have heard is having enough time for the victim to break away. Is it constitutional to make it illegal for the perpetrator to contact one of his ex-victims for a period of time? Also, is there a fiscal note on this bill?

**James Sweetin:**

We commonly do everything we can to prevent a perpetrator from having contact with the victims. That includes court orders. Many times, if they do receive probation, that is a condition of probation; certainly when they are on parole, that is a condition of parole. I am not sure that we can monitor them beyond that. If they commit a sexual crime where they are under lifetime supervision, there might be some control there.

**Senator Segerblom:**

So, if a perpetrator does go back to a victim and we catch him, is there any way we can throw him back in prison?

**James Sweetin:**

So long as they are under some sort of supervision, whether it be probation or parole, or if they are in custody and under state control.

**Michon Martin:**

The problem is these victims need more time than we could provide in probation or parole. For example, the individual we heard about earlier, termed out, and there is no oversight of that individual whatsoever.

**Chairman Frierson:**

Are there any other questions? I see none. At this time I would like to invite those in support of A.B. 67 to come forward.

**Mark B. Jackson, District Attorney, Douglas County District Attorney's Office:**

I am in support of A.B. 67. I have been very fortunate and privileged over the last six years to work with the Attorney General on some very important issues affecting all Nevadans. We worked together on the previous governor's methamphetamine working group. I serve on her Substance Abuse Working Group. We served together on the Advisory Commission on the Administration of Justice, and we spent a lot of time discussing this specific issue last year. We served together on the Nevada Council for the Prevention of Domestic Violence, and also on the Domestic Violence Fatality Review Statewide Team.

About two years ago the Attorney General talked to me about sex trafficking. I will tell you that even though I am a prosecutor, I was somewhat ignorant of the full force of this, not only globally, but across this nation and as well as here in Nevada. The Attorney General started off by talking about 21 million sex-trafficking victims worldwide. About half of those are minor victims. The United States is one of the three largest destination points for sex-trafficking victims in the world. Los Angeles is the number 1 point of entry into the United States. The four top destination states in the United States are New York, Texas, California, and Nevada. The largest sex trafficking triangle that has been identified by the Polaris Project and Hope International is Los Angeles to Las Vegas to Sacramento. This is, without a doubt, in all of the legislation that I have dealt with on health and safety issues for Nevadans, the most significant piece of human rights legislation that I have ever been associated with. I would submit to you that it is the most significant piece of human rights legislation that you will ever deal with.

As a prosecutor I would like to address a few of the sections of the bill, namely section 7, dealing with preliminary hearings. I would like to go into what a preliminary hearing is. At trial the prosecution has to establish beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant committed the crime for which he has been charged, and all of those elements of that crime will be laid out for the jury, including definitions. At a preliminary hearing, the state does not have that burden. We have to establish by slight, even marginal evidence that a crime may have been committed and that the defendant may have been involved in some capacity in the commission of that particular crime. Section 7 of this bill does nothing to strip away rights of the accused.

I would also like to add to the purpose of preserving the testimony for the prosecution is that in Douglas County we do not see the sex trafficking that Clark County does, but we do have our share, and a large percentage of our cases are domestic-violence battery types of cases. What you will see is that in domestic violence cases, at the core of it is the threats and intimidation. The biggest enemy of the prosecution of the law enforcement and the prosecuting attorneys in these cases is the lapse of time. Time is always on the side of the defendant who is accused of a crime, and the more time that lapses, the more difficult it is for the prosecution to be able to bring forward justice in their jurisdiction. The ability to preserve the testimony of these victims is paramount to the success of this particular legislation. Without it we will find the same thing we are seeing in our domestic violence cases: the inability to preserve the testimony of the victim. A few months go by, we lose contact with the victim, case goes to trial, we do not have a victim and the case gets dismissed. The perpetrator becomes more powerful and continues to commit crimes.

I met with Michon Martin last year to go over the draft language. I had proposed to her that prosecutors had a difficulty under section 41, subsection 5 in establishing that prostitution had to be for a fee, and that it has been described as other incidents that go beyond the monetary value. I think it will be very beneficial to everyone to have language that mirrors the definition of sexual penetration as it is currently codified under NRS 200.364, subsection 4, for sexual assault or sexual seduction. I would also like to add that I am here on behalf of the Nevada District Attorney's Association, which is also in support of A.B. 67.

**Chairman Frierson:**

Regarding those definitions, the "encouraging engagement in prostitution" has been a concern. Right now if someone encourages somebody to drive to a county where prostitution is legal, technically they have violated this provision. I realize that A.B. 67 is proposing to add a force or threat component, which I think is important, but I want to point out that there is a concern about the language as it applies to conduct that is legal in some jurisdictions.

**Dan Edwards, Bishop, Episcopal Diocese of Nevada:**

The Diocese of Nevada is made up of about 35 worshiping communities all around the state. It is unusual that I am also speaking on behalf of my brother, the Roman Catholic bishop, and my brother, the Methodist bishop, who have joined in support of A.B. 67. I want you to understand that this is a historic document ([Exhibit G](#)) as these three bishops and their predecessors have never joined together on anything before.

It is not just us; I am here with Nevadans for the Common Good, which is an interfaith coalition of churches, synagogues, mosques, and secular nonprofits working to make Nevada a better place for families.

I would like to tell you briefly how we got here. Nevadans for the Common Good boarded a bus, the "Freedom Bus" in Las Vegas last night. We rode nine hours through the snow, the darkness, and the high winds, picking up supporters in Tonopah and Fallon. There are easier ways to get from Las Vegas to Carson City, but we came the hard way. We are serious about the legislation, and the reason we had a freedom bus was to make the point that A.B. 67 is about freedom. We do not see this as a vice matter, it is a matter of freedom and about the exploitation of children and about adults held in sex trade against their wills by threats and force. That is the heart of the bill, which is what we are concerned with. In fact, we see A.B. 67 as replacing a much broader and vaguer language with the focus on the issue of freedom. We know this bill will require some refinement; however, the definition of the crime as the



exploitation of a minor or the use of force, violence, fraud, coercion, and intimidation against an adult, the definition of the crime at its heart, longer penalties are at its heart, and to either change the definition or water down the penalties would be to cut the heart out of this bill. That would be a defeat for freedom. It would be policy disaster and an embarrassment for our state. We rode a long way to implore you to be strong and courageous and do what is right for our children.

**Chairman Frierson:**

In the interest of time, I am now going to call for opposition to A.B. 67.

**Jennifer Reed, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I do outreach work with the Sex Workers Outreach Project in Las Vegas, so I have a very different population and perspective that I work with from what we are hearing from the criminal justice side of things. I would like to bring that to light. There are studies being conducted across the nation about the commercial exploitation of children that have real data, and I have yet to hear any real hard data as far as analyzing the problem. I would like to say that evidence is what policy needs to be based on. While I understand there are anecdotes being brought forward that are very powerful and that we need to address, I am very concerned about some wording in the bill that would overly create harm to people who do not fall into the forced trafficking definition, especially for minors.

The way this bill is drafted, as I understand under section 42, anybody that is a minor who is involved in sex trades at all should be considered a trafficked victim. I have a hard time understanding who they are being trafficked by in a lot of these circumstances. There are oftentimes street kids who are trading sex for money because that is their survival. They do not even consider it sex work, it is just their survival; they have no other options. There are people in these kids' network that they are surviving through and are helping them to make money. Oftentimes they help each other by contributing to the living situation.

This could potentially criminalize anyone that is in their support and safety network. It has been found in research in other cities. New York and Atlantic City were the first two studies that were completed. There is a study that was begun in Las Vegas as well, but the project has been held up for the past year. All we have is preliminary data for Las Vegas. I am very concerned about pushing anything through without having a full picture about what is going on in Las Vegas.

There has been a lot of push-back on findings because they were not following the narrative of anecdotes. For that reason the project was held up for the past year looking for any issues as far as how data was being collected and what the narrative was that they were finding. After a year of reviews, they found no issues and we have gotten the green light for the project to go again. There are a couple of professors at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas in the Department of Sociology who are heading this project. You have some of the articles in front of you ([Exhibit H](#)) outlining the conclusions that have been found from other cities. We have the same findings here in Las Vegas. Nearly half of the kids, about 45 percent, were boys who were identified in the commercial child sex trade. About 70 percent of the kids said they had sought assistance at a youth service at least once, but they left it due to a bad experience.

I would like to make the point that nearly all of the youth, 95 percent, said they exchange sex for money because it is the surest way to support themselves. When asked what they would need to help them get out, not one of them indicated they needed to be protected from a pimp or sex trafficker; they all indicated that they needed resources. It was very problematic then to even indicate someone as a sex trafficker in their network. Those people are the ones that help them, oftentimes the same age as them. The concern is that this could actually harm the network that they work within, which is the only way they have of surviving.

**Vanessa Spinazola, representing American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada:**

We have three main problems with the bill. First is the preliminary hearing issue. Even if it was narrowed to sex trafficking, we still believe it would erode critical procedural safeguards. Second is the increased penalties and sentences. In 2007 the Legislature addressed our increased incarceration. We think that the fiscal note may not be accurate, especially with the sex offender registry, that could mean a lot more money for this bill and we would like to flag that for the Committee. Finally, the issue of consent, we believe that adults can consent. There should not be, as in section 1, a blanket deprivation of consent as a defense. We believe that should be a case-by-case basis. [Submitted written comments ([Exhibit I](#)).]

**Christopher Frey, representing Washoe County Public Defender:**

I wanted to address an opposition to section 7 of this bill. I do not believe I have enough time to do that intelligently or persuasively. I have submitted a letter; please consider that my written testimony ([Exhibit J](#)).

**Steve Yeager, representing Clark County Public Defender's Office:**

As you saw, the Clark and Washoe County Public Defender's Offices submitted an amendment ([Exhibit F](#)) to this bill that would essentially take the existing pandering statute and beef up the penalties in an effort to address some of these concerns. Just so everyone knows, our Nevada Supreme Court as recently as two years ago upheld that pandering statute as constitutional. The concern is the breadth of the bill; perhaps we should work on what we already have. A bill of this nature is almost certain to have a number of hurdles in litigation and whether it is constitutional.

A lot of the conduct that we heard about today would be covered by existing criminal law in Nevada. For example, first-degree kidnapping, that could be a category A felony. We heard situations that involved violence, robberies, battery with a deadly weapon, those all can be charged as separate crimes and an egregious case can be stacked in order to get to larger sentencing. I would like for the Committee to consider the amendment which would put some more teeth into the pandering statute, a statute that has been held as constitutional as recently as two years ago.

**Senator Ford:**

We received your three points on A.B. 67 ([Exhibit K](#)). One of your points is that you think that the statute runs afoul of the vagueness doctrine. Can you explain your position in that regard?

**Steve Yeager:**

My concern is in the definitions; for example, the definition of prostitution, to include the idea of anything of value added in. We can have situations where individuals could be prosecuted, not knowing that what they were doing would fit under the definition as enunciated in the law. Those are challenges that I believe would be made to the statutes because of the amplification of the definitions that already exist. I wanted to submit that to the Committee so you knew what the standard was when a court would look at whether this was an enforceable provision, were it to pass. The standard they look at is whether a normal person would know that their conduct would be criminalized.

**Senator Ford:**

Could you present to the Committee what provisions you think run afoul of the vagueness doctrine?

**Steve Yeager:**

I would be happy to provide you with that.

**Chairman Frierson:**

Is there anyone else in opposition to A.B. 67?

**Ed Uehling, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I totally agree with the horror stories that have been presented today. But let us look at the cause of those horror stories. Are they caused by prostitution or are they caused by prohibition of prostitution? The pimps are created by the prohibition. Child prostitution is caused by prohibition. The violence, the beatings, et cetera are caused by prohibition of prostitution. What is the cause of the prohibitions? Ambitious politicians who want to come forth with their usual mob of religious people.

**Chairman Frierson:**

I think what you are saying is that you believe that the cause of the problem that we have is the fact that prostitution is not legal throughout the state. I certainly welcome your testimony; I do not believe that measure is before us at this time. I would ask you to summarize your comments.

**Ed Uehling:**

It is the very law that you are considering that would create more of this violence, more of the problems that have been pointed out so clearly today. Who is involved? The ambitious politicians and the police who want to jail everyone.

**Chairman Frierson:**

We get the gist of your testimony, I would invite you to provide your testimony in writing. I think your concerns are beyond the purview of this particular bill.

**Ed Uehling:**

This bill will create more of what you say you are trying to avoid.

**Amy Coffee, Office of the Public Defender, Clark County:**

I am here on behalf of the Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice (NACJ). I concur with the position of the Washoe and Clark County Public Defenders and the ACLU. The NACJ has many concerns with this bill that are too lengthy to go into detail. In general, I agree that existing pandering statutes, which have been around since 1913, can be improved as well as the existing restitution and forfeiture laws that we have.

**Christie Craig, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I concur with the ACLU. My primary concern is section 7, which relates to the preliminary hearing process. I think it represents a complete shift in the basic

fabric of our court system. The idea of taking away the defendant's right to waive a preliminary hearing could affect his due process rights and run afoul of both the *Nevada State Constitution* and the *Constitution of the United States*. I think that the rationales for eliminating the preliminary hearing lacked merit. The idea that the alleged defendant could somehow manipulate or try to dissuade a witness is a crime. There are many ways that can be prevented. If they are in jail, they lose their right to use the telephone. If they are out of jail, they can be prosecuted for dissuading. The process continues whether they have a preliminary hearing or not. The idea that somehow the time that it takes to get to trial is a way of getting back at the victim just does not hold water with the way the system is set up.

The process also has a way of dealing with witnesses that are difficult to find and witnesses who do not want to participate. Judge Voy stated that quite often witnesses are held under material witness warrants. The process is already in place that allows the courts to deal with these sorts of issues. The rationale behind section 7 is inappropriate and could be unconstitutional.

**Chairman Frierson:**

Is there anyone else hoping to testify in opposition? Seeing none, I will now hear those wishing to testify in support of A.B. 67.

**Camille Naaktgeboren, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I would like to share my experience with sex trafficking and why I feel this bill is important. When I was 14, I was sold to a group of men, each of whom took turns raping me. [Continued to read from prepared text ([Exhibit L](#)).]

**Chairman Frierson:**

Thank you. I mean this for you, Ms. Ayoub, and Ms. Swanson, I think you are the heroes. This is the way good policy starts; from the experience of those brave enough to share their story.

**Michael Patterson, representing Lutheran Advocacy Mission in Nevada and Religious Alliance in Nevada:**

I am here on behalf of the Religious Alliance in Nevada (RAIN) and the Episcopal Diocese of Nevada. I submitted my testimony earlier ([Exhibit M](#)) but I would like to specifically address section 53, which allows for the special account to accept donations for the children's advocate. I would like to ask that you expand that to allow donations to be accepted for treatment centers, especially the Polaris Project and Awaken, Inc. We have already begun fundraising; the money will begin flowing as soon as the Legislature passes that portion of the bill. We have a history of doing this. We helped with the prison reentry

program by raising the funds to pay for the cost of the identification cards for the prisoners. We encourage you to pass this bill with the expansion of receiving the funds.

**Melissa Holland, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

I am in favor of A.B. 67. I am the founder of an organization called Awaken, Inc., which is in northern Nevada. For the last three years I have been doing direct services with the victims of sex trafficking. [Continued to read from prepared text ([Exhibit N](#)).]

We have partnered up with RAIN and volunteers from the Junior League as well. We know there is a fiscal note attached to this. We know there is a cost, and it is going to be great. The community wants this to happen. We have petitions with hundreds of signatures and people contributing their own money, and we have raised the funds for a fiscal note. The community wants this. We will cover the cost for this, because we want it. [Unidentified gentleman accompanying Melissa Holland held up a large blank check to the Committee.]

**Chairman Frierson:**

I do not know if we are allowed to accept contributions for a fiscal note, but I will also remind you that this is not a money committee, this is a policy committee.

**Aslam Abdullah, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

Our organization, Nevadans for the Common Good, has provided counseling to a number of victims during the last seven years. I am sure ours is not the only religious organization, there are many synagogues, churches, and mosques that have provided shelter to the victims. We recently did a survey of nearly 300 people in Las Vegas. We found almost all 300 people to be from different ethnicities and groups and cultures supporting this bill. The religious community and the faith-based groups have been doing their jobs in terms of taking care of those victims and in standing up for them. I think it is now time for the Assembly to pass this bill as soon as possible so that we, together, can address the issue effectively.

**Kristine Richter, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

I am here today with members from the Junior League of Reno to express our full support for A.B. 67. [Continued to read from prepared text ([Exhibit O](#)).]

**George Flint, representing Select Legal Brothels of Nevada:**

I have never been more proud to appear before this Legislature than I am today, having served as the only brothel lobbyist in the entire world for the last

28 years. We have heard today from both Ms. Cortez Masto and Ms. Martin that there is no intention in any of this bill to attack my client. However, I will tell you that my client is quite nervous about section 42. We are a brick and mortar target. We are not an exploiter, a pimp that can hide under the bushes or disappear; we are out there big and center. Some of my clients have as much as \$15 million invested in the legal brothel industry in this state.

As a result, I asked for a very simple exemption. As long as I am being told by the Attorney General's Office that if this is not being aimed at the brothels, let us put it in writing. Ms. Cortez Masto may be governor someday, and maybe a different Attorney General will have a different thought. Each of you has in your hands the amendment that I presented to both of the Chairmen on Monday, February 18 ([Exhibit P](#)). It is three lines, and I pray for your consideration because it will let my client sleep better at night. His fear is that some aggressive prosecutor or some aggressive private attorney will decide that maybe this bill does affect my client. The chances are my client would win in court, but at what cost?

Thank you for your courtesy. As I stated earlier, I have never been more proud to support any bill than the basic concept and the basic intentions of attempting to slow this evil criminal activity down. This is a start in the right direction. Again, all I ask for are the three lines, "The provisions of this chapter insofar as human trafficking, sex trafficking, and transportation for such purposes have no intended enforcement effect as relates to the state's legal, controlled and regulated houses of prostitution."

**Allan Smith, representing The Religious Alliance in Nevada (RAIN):**

We are here in support of A.B. 67 primarily because of the victim issue. We feel it is important that our victims receive proper treatment, that they have the safety and rehabilitation that they need, including health evaluation, training, and education, life skills, and building their self-esteem. We also believe they need to be in a safe environment which includes a safe house and taking the perpetrators out of their life and putting them somewhere they will not be bothered. We feel A.B. 67 addresses both of these issues very well and we support it.

**Chairman Frierson:**

I would like to remind folks, if someone from your organization has already testified, it is fine to indicate you agree with the statement previously made.

**Robert Roshak, representing Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association:**

I would like to express our total support for A.B. 67. I believe all of the law enforcement issues have been covered.

**Eric Spratley, Lieutenant, Washoe County Sheriff's Office:**

We firmly support A.B. 67.

**John Caparella, Nevada Resort Association:**

I have submitted a letter stating our support of A.B. 67 ([Exhibit Q](#)). I would like to make another point. In 1990 I was general manager of the Sheraton Manhattan in New York. There was a random killing in the subway one Saturday night. The victim's name was Brian Watkins, who became the poster child for everything that was wrong in New York. It killed the tourism industry. It was the linchpin of what changed New York into the renaissance that it has become today. There is a significant miss if this Legislature does not pass this bill. I would hate to be the legislator on record that killed this bill for that reason.

**Chairman Frierson:**

I would encourage folks to help facilitate a fruitful and thoughtful contemplation of these issues. These seats are the people's seats, they are not ours. And whether or not any of us is reelected, that is not what we are here for today. We are here to represent our districts and pass good, strong policy that will survive the test of time. I encourage witnesses that come before us and communicate with the Assembly to keep that in mind and encourage us to do just that. I would hope that members of the public do not want us so worried about elections that we simply cannot do the right thing.

**Senator Segerblom:**

The Senate has to go to floor session now. I would like to commend Attorney General Masto for your hard work, and commend the testifiers here today. It is fantastic to see everyone gathered around this very important issue.

**Jade Hickman, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

I am speaking on behalf of the Nevada Episcopal Youth Community. We as teenagers support this bill because we do not want to live in a state where teens are exploited. We also support this bill because it not only gives the victims a voice, but it also protects them. We ask you as parents and legislators to please support A.B. 67.



**Aubrey Hall, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

I am a member of Sex Workers Anonymous. I want it to be known that sex trafficking is not only on the streets, or only on the Internet. It also occurs in legal brothels. I think it is very important to realize that pimps do go into the brothels. My trafficker took me from California to work at a brothel here because he saw it on a television show. That is how I ended up in the industry. I think it is important for you to know that it is not just illegal work. It does have lasting effects on us. I am on Supplemental Security Income, which is a burden on the economy. I have serious problems. Someone stated that the johns who are violent are guilty of trafficking. Johns are violent in legal brothels as well. There are panic buttons in each room, but you cannot reach them when you are on the bed. Sex Workers Anonymous does have a phone number that is on the website.

**Marlene Lockhard, representing Nevada Women's Lobby:**

I will submit my written testimony ([Exhibit R](#)). The Nevada Women's Lobby would like to go on record as strongly supporting this legislation; however, we do have the same concerns that have been expressed with sections 7 and 8.

**Helen McPeak, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada:**

I speak to you today as a mother of two healthy, attractive junior high school boys. It scares me that alert families are missing the process of grooming going on in our state. I hear law enforcement ask for the tools to address that, a holistic approach. I would like to see these people work together to protect the rights of the victims of sex trafficking as effectively as we are protecting the rights of the traffickers. People are being broken in ways we have not seen before. We must equip this state to respond. Please support A.B. 67.

**Susan Meuschke, representing Nevada Network Against Domestic Violence:**

I have submitted testimony ([Exhibit S](#)). We are in support of this bill.

**Chairman Frierson:**

I will now hear testimony from those in Las Vegas.

**Toshia Shaw, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I come before you as a supporter of A.B. 67 first and foremost as a survivor of sex trafficking. After having served my country in the military for seven years, I was threatened and forced to prostitute myself in a motel. I was raped daily by john after john, in cheap motels. I begged and pleaded for my life. I asked these johns, "After you get done with what you feel you need to do with my body, after you get done paying my pimp for what you have done with my body, please alert the authorities, because I am here, not on my own, I am here

through force. Please help me." No help came. I did not know from day to day if I was going to live or die. I was told that if I did not prostitute myself they would kill my son in front of me and murder my family. So, I prostituted because I had no other choice.

I also come before you as the founder and president of Purple W.I.N.G.S. which is Women Inspiring Noble Girls Successfully. Our goal is preventing, rescuing, and restoring young girls between the ages of 13 and 18—my youngest was 11—from sex trafficking. These are girls who have not been picked up by police yet. These are girls who present themselves with a myriad of problems, drug abuse, drop-outs; they have been abused and molested at home. They have problems. After working with them in group sessions, the sex trafficking appears. Because I know what to look for, I am able to give them help. I am asking you for your support in A.B. 67 because we have no other choice.

I want you all to know that Purple W.I.N.G.S. is the first grass-roots organization for at-risk girls. At-risk girls are the gateway for sex trafficking. This problem is real, and we do have data from the public hospital. We are a small network, but we are strong, and we need your help to support our girls to be safe and secure and get services and protection. Please support A.B. 67.

**Chairman Frierson:**

I cannot go on without acknowledging your service both to our country and continued service helping these young people who are going through something you can relate to. I applaud you for continuing to provide that service.

**Marta Poling-Goldenne, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada:**

I serve as pastor of New Song Luthern Church in Henderson. My congregation is actively involved in Nevadans for the Common Good. We support A.B. 67 because it is the foundation for addressing this issue. We need clear statutes for protecting children and prosecuting traffickers. This legislation provides a holistic approach to combat sex trafficking. The issue of human trafficking has garnered a worldwide audience as the human community has recognized that there are more human slaves now than at any point in human history. In other words, we are at a tipping point on facing the crimes associated with sex trafficking. We are asking you to tip in the right direction. I am not referring to politics, but to what is morally right to do. We are here to say that we do not want Nevada to tolerate any longer the criminal enterprise of human trafficking, especially of our children. Assembly Bill 67 needs the support of additional legislation to provide safe harbor and victim services. I say Amen, which means so be it, may it be so to everything Judge Voy has advocated. This legislation is fundamental to bring perpetrators of human sex trafficking to justice and to

protect our children from human trafficking predators. I earnestly urge you to wholeheartedly support the passage of A.B. 67.

**Malcolm Cohen, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I represent the Jewish community alongside our Christian and Muslim brothers and sisters. We are firmly in support of the passage of A.B. 67. I want to state very clearly that we have been exposed to not only the anecdotes that we have heard today, but many more of them from teachers, counselors, and police. We have also been exposed to the statistics and hard data regarding this problem. We see it across our congregations, across the state. Very clearly, we understand that the problem exists in the poor neighborhoods and in the well-off neighborhoods in our state. Assembly Bill 67 is a very concrete way to bring this shadowy menace to light and fight against it. The last thing I want to say is that even though there are hundreds of cases across the state, if you, as legislators actually get to the point where you can save the life of one of these victims and help separate them from their trafficker, then you will have fulfilled the purpose of your seat.

**Quin Rivers, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am a retired juvenile probation officer, and worked with Child Protective Services, Clark County Department of Family Services on the Sexual Abuse Investigation Team. I am now affiliated with Purple W.I.N.G.S. My sorority, Alpha Kappa Alpha, is working very closely with this organization. One of our initiatives is social justice and human equality. At this time I would like to go on record that we are in support of A.B. 67.

**Barbara Agonia, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am currently serving as president of Soroptomist International Greater Las Vegas. We are a worldwide organization committed to improving the lives of women and girls locally and globally. We are strongly in favor of A.B. 67 which will help to make Nevada a leader in anti-trafficking legislation. We urge you to please pass this bill.

**Tim O'Callaghan, representing Catholic Diocese of Las Vegas:**

Ditto.

**Chairman Frierson:**

Is there anyone who would like to testify as neutral?

**Elisa P. Cafferata, President and CEO, Nevada Advocates for Planned Parenthood Affiliates:**

I have submitted written comments ([Exhibit T](#)), the main point being that we are very concerned and that we support the efforts to help the victims. We are concerned that victims be able to access reproductive health care, more specifically, emergency contraceptives. These are time sensitive and we want to make sure victims can have access to that type of health care immediately without any delays or judgment. There are sections in the bill that deal with transportation of girls who are in the life. Certainly, if a young girl in high school asks a friend to take her to a health center for some reason, we would like to ensure that that does not get criminalized under this bill.

**Chairman Frierson:**

I would like to give the Attorney General an opportunity to make any closing statements.

**Catherine Cortez Masto:**

Thank you to both the Senate and Assembly Judiciary Committees for agreeing to this joint session. This is such an important issue to all of us, and I know it is to all of you. You have heard from many different voices today. I think we all recognize this as an important legislation. I am here to tell you that we are willing to work with all of you to ensure that it is a positive piece of legislation that really will do the job, that will protect not only our juveniles but the adults that are forced into prostitution. I know that collaboratively we can move forward. The most important thing about this is that we need to take back the rights of our children. We need to take back and protect our children and our young adults who are being victimized.

**Chairman Frierson:**

Thank you for all your hard work and bringing this issue to our attention. I will now close the hearing on Assembly Bill 67. I thank everyone for their patience and passion and for the respectful dialogue we had today. Is there anyone here for public comment? I see none. With that we are adjourned [at 11:44 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Nancy Davis  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblyman Jason Frierson, Chairman

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

---

Senator Tick Segerblom, Chairman

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

## EXHIBITS

**Committee Name:** Committee on Judiciary

**Date:** February 20, 2013

**Time of Meeting:** 8:05 a.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
A.B. 67	C	Catherine Cortez Masto, Attorney General	Opening Remarks
A.B. 67	D	Ron Chalmers, Sergeant, Reno Police Department	Prepared Testimony
A.B. 67	E	Tiffany Short, Victim Specialist, Federal Bureau of Investigation	Prepared Testimony
A.B. 67	F	Clark & Washoe County Public Defender's Offices	Proposed Amendment
A.B. 67	G	Dan Edwards, Bishop, Episcopal Diocese of Nevada	Prepared Statement
A.B. 67	H	Jennifer Reed, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada	Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children in New York City
A.B. 67	I	Vanessa Spinazola, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada	Written Comments
A.B. 67	J	Chris Frey, Washoe County Public Defender	Prepared Statement
A.B. 67	K	Steve Yeager, Clark County Public Defender's Office	Prepared Statement
A.B. 67	L	Camille Naaktgeboren, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada	Prepared Testimony
A.B. 67	M	Michael Patterson, Lutheran Advocacy Mission in Nevada	Prepared Testimony
A.B. 67	N	Melissa Holland, Private Citizen	Prepared Statement
A.B. 67	O	Kristine Richter, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada	Prepared Testimony
A.B. 67	P	George Flint, representing Select Legal Brothels of Nevada	Proposed Amendment
A.B. 67	Q	John Caparella, Nevada Resort Association	Prepared Statement
A.B. 67	R	Marlene Lockhard, representing Nevada Women's Lobby	Prepared Testimony

A.B. 67	S	Susan Meuschke, Nevada Network Against Domestic Violence	Prepared Statement
A.B. 67	T	Elisa Cafferata, Nevada Advocates for Planned Parenthood Affiliates	Prepared Statement