

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
OF THE  
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES**

**Eightieth Session  
March 13, 2019**

The Committee on Health and Human Services was called to order by Chair Michael C. Sprinkle at 1:34 p.m. on Wednesday, March 13, 2019, in Room 3138 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4406 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 [www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/80th2019](http://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/80th2019).

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblyman Michael C. Sprinkle, Chair  
Assemblyman Alex Assefa  
Assemblywoman Bea Duran  
Assemblywoman Michelle Gorelow  
Assemblyman Gregory T. Hafen II  
Assemblywoman Lisa Krasner  
Assemblywoman Connie Munk  
Assemblywoman Rochelle T. Nguyen  
Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson  
Assemblywoman Robin L. Titus

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Assemblyman Richard Carrillo (excused)  
Assemblyman John Hambrick (excused)

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Assemblywoman Shea Backus, Assembly District No. 37

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Patrick Guinan, Senior Principal Policy Analyst  
Marshellah Lyons, Committee Policy Analyst  
Karly O'Krent, Committee Counsel  
Christian Thauer, Committee Manager and Secretary  
Alejandra Medina, Committee Assistant

Minutes ID: 559



**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Nancy M. Saitta, Justice (Retired), Chair, Nevada Coalition to Prevent the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services  
Ross E. Armstrong, Administrator, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services; and Co-Chair, Nevada Coalition to Prevent the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children  
Brigid J. Duffy, Chief Deputy District Attorney, Juvenile Division, Office of the District Attorney, Clark County; and Member, Nevada Coalition to Prevent the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children  
Bailey Bortolin, representing Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada; and Washoe Legal Services  
Amber L. Howell, Director, Human Services Agency, Washoe County  
A.J. Delap, Government Liaison, Office of Intergovernmental Services, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department  
Kimberly Mull, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Katie Roe Ryan, Director, Public Policy, Dignity Health-St. Rose Dominican  
Marlene Lockard, representing Nevada Women's Lobby  
Kelly Venci Gonzalez, Staff Attorney, Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada  
Stephanie Cook, Supervising Attorney, Child Advocacy Program, Washoe Legal Services  
Lindsay Anderson, Director, Government Affairs, Washoe County School District  
Bradley Keating, Director, Government Relations, Clark County School District  
Michael Flores, Chief of Staff, Nevada System of Higher Education

**Chair Sprinkle:**

[Roll was called. Committee policies were explained.] We will hear two bills today, Assembly Bill 151, and Assembly Bill 156. The sponsor of both bills, Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno, Assembly District No. 1, is sick today, but she has others ready to present on her behalf. I will go ahead and open the hearing on Assembly Bill 151.

**Assembly Bill 151: Provides for the protection of children who are victims of commercial sexual exploitation. (BDR 38-457)**

**Patrick Guinan, Senior Principal Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau:**

I am here on behalf of Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno in her capacity of Chair of the 2017-2018 Interim Legislative Committee on Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice. I am also the committee staffer for that interim committee. The bill you have before you today, Assembly Bill 151, was requested by that committee on behalf of the Nevada Coalition to Prevent the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services. I will briefly go through some remarks that Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno was going to deliver. Before that, however, I need to point out that, as staff of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, I do not advocate for or against any

legislation. I am here only to provide information. When I have finished doing that, I will relinquish my seat to other expert testifiers who know what they are talking about.

Assembly Bill 151 is designed to do three things. It is, first, designed to ensure compliance with the federal law to report cases of commercial sexual exploitation. Second, it is to provide an avenue that links survivors of commercial sexual exploitation to resources following an assessment. Third, it is meant to ensure the protection of confidentiality of those who make reports of commercial child sexual exploitation.

The interim committee is proud to bring this bill forward for consideration. At this point, I would like to hand the presentation over to Nancy Saitta, a retired Nevada Supreme Court Justice.

**Nancy M. Saitta, Justice (Retired), Chair, Nevada Coalition to Prevent the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services:**

I will start with a simple yet sobering fact. The thought of children being sold for sex on a nightly basis is deeply disturbing, but all too real. Across this fine nation, we believe there is a \$32 billion industry that supports the trafficking of young people. In fact, we know—or our estimates can bring us very close to this statistic—that over 100,000 children are trafficked in the United States. Of these 100,000 children, somewhere between 50 to 80 percent of those victims have been involved with our child welfare system.

Let me briefly tell you about the work of the Nevada Coalition to Prevent the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children. We were created in 2016 as a result of a federal mandate. The federal government required each state to convene in a way that would take a broad-based look at what, if any, resources, services, or initiatives were available for young children in the trafficking industry. The mandate also required the states, based on this assessment, to take action. It would take far too long to tell you about all the people I have had the pleasure of working with in the context of the Coalition, such as our Co-Chair, Mr. Armstrong. I am, however, pleased to be able to tell you that the Coalition included experts from every conceivable stakeholder involved that would touch the lives of children. All we ask in this bill is for there to be an appropriate section within our statutory scheme—more precisely in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 432, to which the bill would add Chapter 432C—to protect child victims of commercial sexual exploitation.

My introductory comments are based on my experience of the privilege of chairing the Coalition. Mr. Armstrong will now speak to the effect this legislation might have on the child welfare system. This is followed by a presentation of the nuts and bolts of the bill, which will be taken care of by Ms. Brigid Duffy. Thank you so much for allowing us to appear in front of this Committee.

**Ross E. Armstrong, Administrator, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services; and Co-Chair, Nevada Coalition to Prevent the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children:**

It is a true honor to appear in front of this Committee with Ms. Duffy and Ms. Saitta, who are two of our biggest champions for kids in the state of Nevada.

Assembly Bill 151 helps the state become compliant with the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015. When a state child welfare agency falls out of compliance with federal law, a program improvement plan (PIP) is adopted. The current PIP with the federal government states that the child welfare agencies shall come to the Legislature and ask for a statutory framework giving them the ability to receive and respond to reports of commercial child sex trafficking. The Nevada Coalition to Prevent the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children was tasked with developing such a framework. The bill before you today is the result of the work of the Coalition.

It is important to know that previously we, the child welfare agencies, did not have inherent authority to take any action in response to a report of a commercially sexually exploited child unless the trafficking was being done by a parent, guardian, or someone else legally responsible for that child. Everything else fell out of the jurisdiction of the Division of Child and Family Services. This bill changes that. It allows the Division, in response to such a report, to determine if there is familial trafficking or not. If there is no familial trafficking, the Division has the opportunity to help assess the family and connect the survivor with services in the community that can help that survivor heal. At the same time, the bill preserves the confidentiality that we have with reports of child abuse and neglect, which is critical given the dynamics of the sexual exploitation of children.

Thank you for considering this bill which will help us achieve federal compliance and provide safe communities. I will hand the presentation over to Brigid Duffy, who will walk you through its major components.

**Brigid J. Duffy, Chief Deputy District Attorney, Juvenile Division, Office of the District Attorney, Clark County; and Member, Nevada Coalition to Prevent the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children:**

Assembly Bill 151 is the result of hard work and brainpower of amazing advocates. I am honored to be walking you through it today. Section 1 of the bill creates a new chapter in the NRS. Sections 2 to 11 are definition sections. Section 12 creates a permissive reporting mechanism to a child welfare agency for any citizen in the state of Nevada. Subsection 2 of section 12 creates a mandated reporting requirement if a mandated reporter "has reasonable cause to believe that a child is a commercially sexually exploited child." Section 12, subsection 3, puts in a requirement to call law enforcement as well as the child welfare agencies, "If an alleged perpetrator of the commercial sexual exploitation of a child is or is alleged to be present with the child, or if the child is otherwise in imminent danger." Subsection 4 lays out penalties for failing to report.

Section 13 of A.B. 151 starts to demonstrate what a child welfare agency has to do when it receives a report. The agency has to conduct the initial screening. It is also obliged to cross-report to law enforcement, and it has the ability to cross-report to out-of-state child welfare agencies. Oftentimes, we have child victims that are coming in from other states. This last provision allows the child welfare agency to cross-report the case back to the child's state of origin. In these cases the law still allows the child welfare agency to conduct an assessment under NRS Chapter 432B to determine if there is a person legally responsible for the child's welfare who is also responsible for the child's commercial sexual exploitation.

Section 13, subsection 2, states that if a case is not eligible under NRS Chapter 432B—meaning that there is not a person legally responsible for the child's welfare who is also responsible for the child's commercial sexual exploitation—then the child welfare agency may still assess that family and that child to determine what services are needed to address the sexual exploitation. To explain further, if a family is outside of NRS Chapter 432B, the child welfare agency can refer that family for any services that family may need to address the exploitation. The child welfare agency itself may provide the respective counseling services, or it may refer the family to an outside agency.

Subsection 3 lays out a report-back requirement if a case is referred to an outside agency. If an outside agency recognizes at any time during the assessment or servicing of a family that the family is not participating in the services, is refusing the services, or that the child and family may be at risk, they have to report it back to the child welfare agency for additional assessment.

Section 14 creates confidentiality of all these reports and assessments and penalties for release. Section 15 defines exceptions to this general confidentiality rule. This section mirrors the current NRS Chapter 432B child welfare statutes of exceptions to confidentiality.

Section 16 is a conforming change in existing statutes to ensure that the new section will be appropriately referred to. Section 17 adds to the public record section of current statute. Section 18 states that it is not a violation of patient confidentiality for a mental health care services provider if she or he reports instances of commercial sexual exploitation. Section 19 allows for a licensing board to discipline or revoke a license if the licensee fails to report under the mandate defined in the bill.

This is my quick walk-through. The bill is much longer though, so please ask us questions. In closing, I would like to add that the approach of A.B. 151, to create a separate statutory section dedicated to the protection of our child victims of commercial sexual exploitation, is innovative across the country. We are separating these victims out from our juvenile justice system and from the child welfare system and are giving them the credit they need in their own section to assure that they are serviced adequately. This has been in my head since 2013, and I believe that this honors our victims and our community. It will allow us to save children and strengthen their families. Thank you for allowing me to walk you through the bill. We are ready to answer any questions that you have.

**Chair Sprinkle:**

Thank you very much. I will open it up for questions.

**Assemblywoman Titus:**

Thank you for bringing this bill forward. As a matter of clarification, we as health care professionals are already mandated to report child abuse if we suspect it in any way. Commercial sexual exploitation is child abuse. What does the bill's specific focus on commercial sexual exploitation add to that? What if there is sexual exploitation but without any money or commerce involved? I would like to hear some clarifications on the terminology concerning these questions.

**Brigid Duffy:**

Section 6 of the bill defines commercial sexual exploitation. It is a definition that includes monetary and nonmonetary benefits. Why did we decide to separate this out from sexual exploitation, which is child abuse under NRS Chapter 432B? Under NRS Chapter 432B, the abuser has to be a parent, guardian, or a person otherwise legally responsible for the child, such as a legal custodian. However, most exploiters and traffickers are not parents or guardians. They are usually strangers or perpetrators in the community. Children who are being sexually exploited by a nonfamily member—for example, by a roommate in the home—do not, however, fall under NRS Chapter 432B. The bill addresses these cases. It does not, thereby, invalidate NRS Chapter 432B in any way or question the services and procedures that are in place for cases of child abuse within the family or by a person legally responsible for the child. Instead, the bill specifically targets cases in which the perpetrator of the exploitation is not a person legally responsible for the welfare of the child that is being exploited.

**Assemblyman Thompson:**

I have a question about the definition of "child" the bill provides in section 4. The traditional approach is to say that childhood stops at the age of 18—but does it really? Especially regarding dollars spent in relation to the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act of 2014, the state is looking to expand that definition to also incorporate transitional age youth and young adults up to 24 years of age. I am just wondering, what is the rationale on the specific definition of "child" in the bill?

**Brigid Duffy:**

Right now, childhood stops at the age of 18 for child welfare agencies. Juvenile justice agencies can go up to 21 if the person is already on probation—which means that the young adult has to have committed the offense before she or he turned 18. We are thus using standard language of what is commonly accepted as the end of childhood.

**Assemblyman Thompson:**

If the commercial sexual exploitation of a child started at, say, 17 years and 6 months of age and continued from then on, everything else—the scars—also continued. The point I am making here is that the exploitation can continue beyond the age of 18, beyond the point at which a victim officially enters adulthood.

**Brigid Duffy:**

If I understand you correctly, when you said 17 years and 6 months of age, you were referring to a situation in which we would only have six months to provide services to a victim of commercial sexual exploitation, and that our services would have to stop after six months once the victim turned 18. Or would we still be able to mandate anything to support this victim from then on? The answer would be, No, we would not be able to do that. However, we would be able to give that person the tools and the referrals she or he would need before that cutoff date. Moreover, I know that the agencies that are out there working with victims of sex trafficking do not stop working with them just because they turned 18. However, having said that, it is true that under the definition of childhood which the bill applies, we would not be able to take calls of persons 18 and up in our hotline, and we would not be able to refer them to the respective support services for children. Persons 18 and up would have to be referred to an adult system.

**Assemblyman Thompson:**

Would it not be better to follow the rationale of the juvenile justice system in this respect? Should we not consider providing continuing care for victims of commercial sexual exploitation up to 21 years of age? This would mirror what is being done in other systems dealing with juveniles.

The system you suggest creating will be very different from the adult system. I think that we would want to accompany a child who is a victim of commercial sexual exploitation into adulthood and avoid that child confronting the challenge of having to change systems. We know from work with services around this issue that if you cut victims off at 18, even if you have worked with them all these years, they may simply give up or relapse.

**Nancy Saitta**

In response to your inquiry, which is poignant, to say the least, the reality is that if we overburden this particular section of the statutory scheme, we will be facing fiscal burdens. Are they worth carrying them? They absolutely are. But my response to your question is that, as long as we continue in our efforts under this new statutory scheme to identify, to service, and to properly assess these young people, it is my strong belief that our system will surround these children as they transition. We will do more work in this area, including in other arenas, to expand services to children in need of protection. You will thus see me back at this table—and I expect also my friends who are with me today—every single session to amend the new NRS Chapter 432C to incorporate exactly that expansion you are talking about. This is step one in the process that none of us believes ends at age 18. But we are confined by certain boundaries at this point.

**Assemblywoman Gorelow:**

This topic is very near and dear to me. My sister is a detective in Ohio. For about five years in her career, she worked on this exact topic of commercial sexual exploitation of children. It has been very sad hearing some of her stories. During her detective work, she was lead to Reno at one point. The case, in the end, was not substantiated. My question is, What would

a partnership with other states or other jurisdictions look like when an agency is aware that a child might be exploited, yet that child moves to a different district?

**Ross Armstrong:**

Under the statutory regime in this bill, if we found a child in Reno and discovered that the child or the family of the child was involved in the child welfare system in Ohio or that this was where the family was, we could start an investigation to see whether a reunification with the family and getting the kid back home could be a good idea, and then make the respective referral. I believe the Model Coordinated Response Protocol that was adopted by the Nevada Coalition to Prevent the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children has been uploaded on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS) ([Exhibit C](#)). That model protocol specifies in detail how communities should be responding. You will also see in the model protocol that there is not this cut-off age of 18.

**Assemblywoman Gorelow:**

I would like to give a shout-out to Dezi from Dayton, Ohio, who was very close to my sister. Dezi was a victim of human trafficking. She ended up dying from a drug overdose.

**Assemblywoman Nguyen:**

My question concerns section 11, subsection 1, which includes language talking about "reasonable cause to believe," along with several other uses of the word "reasonable" or "reasonably" in this section. "Reasonable" does not appear to be further defined in the bill. It seems that it is only defined and discussed through case law. I was wondering whether this is something you considered further defining in the proposed statutes.

**Brigid Duffy:**

I did not think about further defining it. It really is the same definition that we have in NRS 432B.121 for "reasonable cause to believe." If you would like to discuss it, we can; however, the definition mirrors the notion of "reasonable cause to believe" in child abuse and neglect cases.

**Assemblywoman Duran:**

My question concerns section 7, which states that "Commercially sexually exploited child" refers to a child who is "sexually abused or sexually exploited for the financial benefit of any person or in exchange for anything of value, including, without limitation, monetary or nonmonetary benefits." Is that going to make the difference? Can we not better define "value"? People may think valuable means \$100, \$200, or \$20. My concern is that people may misconstrue the notion of value and say, There is no value. Things may be valuable to me, but they may not be valuable to someone else. Can that be defined in better ways to reflect this problem, that value has a strongly subjective dimension?

**Ross Armstrong:**

When looking at these definitions in both sections 6 and 7 talking about "value" and "exchange for anything of value," it is important to bear in mind what the statute is really doing here. It is triggering the child welfare agency's legal ability to act and respond to the



complaint—as opposed to what might be heavy penalties and, say, a criminal law action. We want to be able to take a call and respond, irrespective of the value that is alleged to be the benefit.

**Assemblywoman Duran:**

Maybe the bill needs to define on what basis the investigation is started. I just do not want somebody to say, There is no value there, or someone on the legal end of things asking, What was the value?

**Brigid Duffy:**

Uploaded on NELIS is a lot of the other work of the Nevada Coalition. [Two documents were submitted that will become part of the record as ([Exhibit D](#)) and ([Exhibit E](#)).] Part of this uploaded work are the training and assessment tools around the identification of cases of commercial sexual exploitation. The bill allows us, when a call comes in, to open up that case. It has to be seen in the context of all the other work the Coalition has done on training hotline workers so that they can recognize that this is a case of commercial sexual exploitation that they can screen in to refer out for assessment and services.

**Nancy Saitta:**

One of the reasons for the vagueness of this definition section is that we want it to allow an overly inclusive ability for the agency to begin an assessment. The matter you are concerned about, which is in my view an appropriate concern, whether or not there is value—monetary or otherwise—will be sorted out down the road in the criminal prosecution. But in the meantime, we will have the ability to offer help and services to this child or this family in a way that we would otherwise not be able to without this legislation.

**Assemblyman Thompson:**

My next question is meant to help court-appointed special advocates (CASAs). I used to be a CASA, so I want to be a voice for them. In section 15, subsection 2, paragraph (g), where it says that "The attorney and the guardian ad litem of the child" or the CASA could be given just limited information. Does this mean that others could get more information? Please clear that up for me. It says, "if the information is reasonably necessary to promote the safety, permanency and wellbeing of the child." When a CASA is sworn in and has a trust relationship with the child, that pretty much comes with access to all information on behalf of the child. The provision, it seems, might be limiting the extent to which the CASA might be able to help. The CASA is going to be very instrumental in this case, so if you could just clarify why the CASA's access to information seems limited in the bill.

**Ross Armstrong:**

The release of information section of the statute mirrors what we have in NRS Chapter 432B, the child welfare act. For each of the different types of disclosures of information, there are slightly different conditions under which information can be disclosed. For example, disclosure to law enforcement agencies—information can only be disclosed if that law enforcement agency is investigating child abuse or neglect according to NRS Chapter 432B. I would say that the conditions defined in paragraph (g) for the CASA or attorney to obtain

information are relatively broadly defined. But they all have slightly different language to ensure that the reason the person is receiving the information is aligned with what their role is in the system.

**Nancy Saitta:**

The language of "reasonably necessary," which appears again here in paragraph (g), may seem troubling. But I think it would be extraordinarily easy for a CASA who has the type of trust relationship you described to meet that requirement. Therefore, release of information should not be problematic at all, as it would be considered as "reasonably necessary" for the representation of the child.

**Assemblyman Hafen:**

My first question relates to Assemblyman Thompson's query and it concerns the age limitation of 18 of designated beneficiaries. Does the federal government define childhood in this way, with this cut-off date? I know that some of what we are discussing here is federally mandated. I am asking as I would not want to limit ourselves from obtaining federal funding. Would we have access to more federal funding if the age limitation was moved to 21 or 24? I just want to make sure that all the resources are available to you.

**Ross Armstrong:**

The bill is consistent with the federal requirement in that it ensures that the child welfare agency has an ability to respond to potential situations of commercial sexual exploitation of children. The federal government does allow some flexibility in having a higher ending age of, say, foster care. But that 18 number is the minimum and keeps us compliant.

**Assemblyman Hafen:**

I know the language mirrors NRS Chapter 432B, but I see that most of the criminal penalties are misdemeanors, and I think one or two are gross misdemeanors. Have you considered a higher level of criminal penalties for some of these offenses?

**Brigid Duffy:**

The misdemeanor is consistent with NRS 432B.240; a second offense is a gross misdemeanor. The same penalty applies to the release of confidential information. We made that a gross misdemeanor, I believe, maybe two sessions ago. It used to be just a misdemeanor. We actually raised it up to gross misdemeanor. We have never really thought about advancing the penalty into a felony. We have kept it at a misdemeanor, and in the case of a second offense, it is a gross misdemeanor.

I should also clarify, none of this is about the perpetrators and their punishment. This is about law enforcement, a doctor, or a teacher failing to meet their requirement of mandated reporting. On the other end of the spectrum, it is about the records that will exist that are confidential, and what happens if these records are illegitimately distributed out to a third party. To make that clear, these penalties are not for the perpetrators of commercial sexual exploitation of children.

**Assemblywoman Munk:**

If you find a child who has been commercially sexually exploited, how long does it take you to get that child out of that situation?

**Brigid Duffy:**

That is really difficult to answer. It may take us finding a child once. But sometimes, it takes us finding a child ten times before she or he gets out of the situation. We can rescue and remove from a situation, but because of the trauma and the reactions children who have been commercially sexually exploited show based upon that trauma, they often will go right back to that situation. To get to the point at which we can get these children out of their situation upon first contact with us, the Coalition seeks to set up surrounding services that are meant to engage these victims when we bring them in. We are trying to make sure we understand the trauma they are going through, so that they can engage with us and want to stay. The bill is thus one piece of a much larger picture which is, however, essential as it will give us a mechanism to get services out there for these victims.

**Chair Sprinkle:**

Will anybody testify in support of A.B. 151?

**Bailey Bortolin, representing Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada; and Washoe Legal Services:**

Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada has been part of the Coalition, and we appreciate the work that has been done. We hope to see it enacted. Thank you.

**Amber L. Howell, Director, Human Services Agency, Washoe County:**

We are in support of the bill, and we wish to thank the Coalition members for their hard work. I would also like to put on the record that the fiscal note on the measure, which you can find under Washoe County Human Services Agency, can be removed. Once it is submitted, you cannot take it out. But it is no longer relevant; there is no fiscal note on this legislation.

**Chair Sprinkle:**

We appreciate that information. Could you please contact the sponsor and let them know so that they can pass that on to the Fiscal Division of the Legislative Counsel Bureau?

**A.J. Delap, Government Liaison, Office of Intergovernmental Services, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:**

We would like to express our support for this measure. I have gotten word from our Vice Section that this is something that has been a very important topic to them over the past three years. We are thankful for this legislation coming forward.

**Kimberly Mull, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

As a victim rights advocate, expert in sexual violence, professional in victim services, and most importantly, survivor of child sex trafficking, I would like to be recorded in strong support of A.B. 151. Assembly Bill 151 aligns Nevada with the national minimums when

servicing child victims of trafficking. The bill ensures continued eligibility for federal funding.

For those of you not familiar with my story, I was trafficked between the age of 11 right up to my fourteenth birthday. It started in child pornography and progressed from their trading my pictures to their trading me. Since then, I have worked with over 400 survivors. I now have my master's degree in victim services management. Just to respond to the Assemblywoman's question on value, I would like to mention that Assemblywoman Krasner has a bill [[Assembly Bill 120](#)] that is speaking to that. The question raised by the Assemblywoman is a very important one, as not everyone is traded for money. I, in particular, was not traded for money, but other things. It is important that we recognize that, and I would like to thank you, Assemblywoman, for asking that question.

I am proud to have served as the public policy intern for Shared Hope International in Washington, D.C., the nation's leading public policy organization on domestic minor sex trafficking, and then as a legislative advocate for U.S. Senator John Cornyn's Office, who sponsored the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015. The Act initiated this exact process of states updating their definitions of child abuse and neglect to better reflect and encompass the unique and still often misunderstood nature of child sex trafficking.

Once I moved to Nevada in 2017, I was honored to be invited to serve as a survivor representative on the Governor's Nevada Coalition to Prevent the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children, legal subcommittee, which made recommendations on this specific bill and on the survivor advisory group, which advised on the Nevada Commercial Exploitation of Children Strategic Plan ([Exhibit D](#)).

Most of the time, when we think about children being victims of trafficking, we think about children being taken, kidnapped, or rushed off from their families. The reality is that I was taken, but I was home for dinner every night. That is something really hard for people to understand. Most of the time, it is not a family member, but someone either related to the family, well-known to the family, or someone in the vicinity of the family. In this respect, the characteristics of commercial sexual exploitation are very similar to other forms of sexual exploitation of children. It is important for the Division of Child and Family Services to be able to serve these children without necessarily assuming that the family is involved and that the family is a perpetrator. This bill will give them this ability, and is therefore very necessary. If this bill would have been available when I was being victimized, if I would have been identified as a victim, then this would have allowed my family and me to receive resources and help without my parents being perceived as being bad or abusive. They are wonderful people.

Many stakeholders, including numerous hardworking individuals at the Division of Child and Family Services, the various child protective services offices around the state, the juvenile court systems, nonprofits, and service providers, are tirelessly working to identify, assist, and offer restoration to these children throughout the state. However, as with any unfunded mandate, they are only able to do so much with the resources they are given. Children who

are routinely overlooked by society become adult burdens on society in numerous and more costly ways. I urge the Assembly Committee on Health and Human Services to support A.B. 151 and to advance this bill out of committee.

**Katie Roe Ryan, Director, Public Policy, Dignity Health-St. Rose Dominican:**

We are here today in strong support of A.B. 151. I participated in a couple of the subcommittees with the Governor's Nevada Coalition to Prevent the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children. About four years ago, Dignity Health-St. Rose Dominican hired a sex trafficking survivor to implement protocols in all our emergency departments and maternal and child health units. We did so specifically to help capture some of these victims. We have also been in the process of collaborating with the Nevada Hospital Association to educate more hospitals in Nevada on this issue.

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

We agree with the testimony that has been provided and the need for this bill and the good that will come of this bill. We strongly ask for your support.

**Chair Sprinkle:**

Is there anyone in southern Nevada wishing to testify in support? [There was no response.] Is there anyone wishing to come forward in opposition in northern or southern Nevada? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to come forward under neutral? [There was no one.]

**Nancy Saitta:**

I urge you to take a close look at all the work that is available to you. It is a tremendous study that the Nevada Coalition to Prevent the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children has undertaken in the last two years. There is everything right about giving our child welfare agencies the ability to serve these children. Thank you to the federal government for making us do it. My deep appreciation to this Committee as I urge you to please pass this bill so that Nevada can walk toward the right place.

**Chair Sprinkle:**

Congratulations on all your hard work. We appreciate your bringing this bill forward. I will close the hearing on A.B. 151. I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 156.

**Assembly Bill 156: Revises provisions governing the education of a child who is in need of protection. (BDR 38-458)**

**Patrick Guinan, Senior Principal Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau:**

I am here on behalf of Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno, as she cannot be here today, to very briefly introduce Assembly Bill 156. As Assembly Bill 151, A.B. 156 is a bill that was brought forward by the 2017-2018 Interim Committee on Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice, for which I was a staff member. The bill addresses a lack in foster youth education. I will let the experts speak to it.

**Bailey Bortolin, representing Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada; and Washoe Legal Services:**

During the 2017-2018 Interim, the Legislative Committee on Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice heard about the important nexus between child welfare and education. Of all foster youth, only 47.5 percent graduate from high school as opposed to 83.9 percent of all non-foster youth. Only 3 percent of foster children graduate from college. Children in foster care struggle greatly to succeed academically while their life is in turmoil. Forty percent of children in foster care have individualized education programs, highlighting the great academic needs of this population. Our discipline data shows that these children are more likely to be disciplined than their peers.

I would like to note that when we first presented this in the 2017-2018 Interim to the Legislative Committee on Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice, we included asking for some support from the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) to help our foster youth receive tuition assistance in college. I would like to thank NSHE and the Board of Regents, along with Senator Yvanna D. Cancela, Senate District No. 10, and Michael Flores, for working with us immediately to take action on that. The Board of Regents actually approved tuition assistance so that foster youth do not have to pay tuition when they attend our home institutions. I would like to state for the record that we are thankful for this assistance, and that we no longer have to move forward with that piece of proposed legislation. We hope to see some great outcomes from this measure.

The bill before you focuses on K-12 and is a continuation of the work the Legislature has undertaken in the last sessions to help prioritize education for our foster youth. I would particularly like to mention in this context Assembly Bill 236 of the 79th Session and Assembly Bill 491 of the 79th Session. Chair Sprinkle helped us with A.B. 236 of the 79th Session, which passed to ensure that child welfare agencies are able to have access to the educational information of foster children. The bill did so by giving child welfare agencies access to Infinite Campus. Assembly Bill 491 of the 79th Session made the inclusion of educational information in court reports a requirement.

The success of these bills, however, has varied and been slow. Whereas Washoe County is a success story—educational information and assessments have become a regular part of court cases in Washoe County—in Clark County, it was only as of last month that we could see that educational information is being included in court hearings and reports. We hope to see more of this in the future. This bill is meant to strengthen the requirement of the inclusion of educational information.

Assembly Bill 156 does two things. First, it requires that a specific person be appointed as educational decision maker for each child in child welfare. Second, it specifies the educational information that should be provided in court reports each time the child goes to court. I will walk you quickly through the bill based on the amendment we submitted and that is available on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System ([Exhibit F](#)).

Section 1 requires that an educational decision maker be appointed. Section 2 lays out how the appointment process will work and creates "a rebuttable presumption"—that it is in the best interest of the child for the educational decision maker to be the parent whenever appropriate. If not appropriate, other parties may be a relative, foster parent, fictive kin, or a guardian. The intent is to ensure that the child's education plan makes sense in the context of the child's permanency plan. If the plan is for the grandmother to adopt the child, we would like to get that grandmother involved sooner in the educational process to be able to focus on that piece of the child's life from early on.

Section 2, subsection 7, lays out the duties of the identified person. There are two friendly amendments in this section based on conversations with Clark County Social Services, clarifying the agency's role in requiring communication between the parties.

Section 3 spells out in greater detail what educational information should be included in a child's court report—the most recent report card, number of absences, credits earned to date, and scores of assessments and tests. This will give us a clearer picture as to whether or not the child needs extra support in school and if that is something we need to be having greater conversations about. Because there are other emergencies in this child's life, oftentimes, by the time we find out that the child is in an academic emergency situation—the child may be a senior with only 12 credits—it is very hard to change the trajectory of that child's educational path. Section 3 is meant to help solve this problem.

Section 3, subsection 11, paragraph (b), of the bill had envisioned to impose a fine in case the educational information was not included in the court report. The amendment in front of you ([Exhibit F](#)) does not include this subsection and idea of a fine anymore.

Section 4 includes the educational decision maker in conversation with the school of origin in determining relevant educational consideration of the child. The foster child has a right to stay in his or her school of origin, meaning the school the child was attending when she or he entered care, if it is in the best interest of the child. I will now turn it over to Kelly Venci Gonzalez in Las Vegas who will speak on the need for the bill.

**Kelly Venci Gonzalez, Staff Attorney, Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada:**

I am the team chief of the Education Advocacy Program for the Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada. I also oversee our Volunteer Education Advocate program. This program provides advocates and education decision makers for kids in foster care who do not have anyone to make decisions for them. We often see kids coming to us in crisis. A child may have not been attending school, may be confronting expulsion from school, or the crisis may consist of academic failure, poor grades, and Fs.

The document I submitted ([Exhibit G](#)) shows that foster children receive far more Fs than their non-foster care cohorts. Often, in these situations of crisis there is no one responsible for making decisions for these children. We then have to rush the case through the court system to try to get an advocate appointed. We thereby regularly encounter children who



look back at years and years of academic failure, and we wonder, Why were these children not tested for special education two or three years ago when they started struggling?

Our hope is that requiring the courts to appoint an education decision maker will make education a conversation in our court cases. Someone will be looking out for these kids, so that, when there is a sign, these children are either immediately referred to us, because they do not have anybody who is making decisions for them, or we can walk alongside and help the relative, the foster parent, or the birth parent making these decisions. I should say that another one of our responsibilities is that we work with relatives and foster parents to help them with special education issues that come up.

We also hope that the bill will allow us to see grades and credits attached to court reports. This would provide us, not only as Children's Attorneys Project (CAP) attorneys—but also case workers or parents' attorneys—with real-time information on what is going on with the kid, how we can help the child. Is the foster child fine in school, or is there a need for intervention? The key here is that we all want to be looking for early intervention to help these kids.

In my written testimony ([Exhibit G](#)) I mention a boy who came to us with a mandatory expulsion. He has had a history of having an individualized education program (IEP) and years of struggle. I could have helped him years ago when he started struggling, but at the point when he came to me, it was already too late and there was not much I was able to do for him. Our hope is that with this bill we can adopt a much more proactive approach to helping these kids and make sure that they are able to succeed just as their non-foster care cohorts.

**Assemblywoman Shea Backus, Assembly District No. 37:**

Apart from being an Assemblywoman, I am also a pro bono attorney and mentor for the Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada. This is the pro bono work that I do outside of my private practice, and I join my colleagues in support of [A.B. 156](#) to address a child's education needs immediately once a child is removed from the care of their parents. Specifically, the bill will allow us to know who will be in charge of addressing such educational needs while the child is in the foster care system. This is imperative to that child's educational success. To illustrate this need, I will share with each of you one of my cases. For purposes of confidentiality, I will vaguely refer to the facts involved in that case.

I represented multiple siblings almost immediately after the filing of the petition alleging that a child is in need of protection. While the mother was active in relation to several of the siblings' educational needs, this involvement was sporadic. I can admit that it can be confusing for the mother as to how she should get involved when a dependency case is opened. However, in this case, my client's mother did not participate in any of the education-related decisions for one of her children. This child was also my client.

My client was in desperate need of being evaluated for an IEP for both behavioral and academic needs. However, she was also being moved between foster care homes and schools



so that she was never at a school long enough for proper evaluation. Almost two years after being removed, we had to petition for the appointment of an educational surrogate for my client. Shortly thereafter she had an IEP plan. So after getting kicked out of school, and the difficulties she had with learning, things finally came together. Whether it is the parent or another designated educational decision maker, such an appointment should be at the outset of any abuse and neglect case to avoid pertinent time passing by waiting after the filing of a petition when there is an educational issue. Thank you for your consideration of A.B. 156.

**Stephanie Cook, Supervising Attorney, Child Advocacy Program, Washoe Legal Services:**

To echo a lot of what has been said, we heard from Ms. Bortolin about the abysmal outcomes for children in foster care in comparison to their non-foster youth. We want to have someone who is identified by the court from the outside of the case to be at the pulse of what is going on with the child educationally. In addition to that, what we see a lot in the school district is that there is confusion on the part of the schools as to who they can release educational information to. By the nature of the situation of a child in foster care, a lot of the schools are not aware that they still should be providing educational information to the birth parents as well as the foster parents. The birth parents should be invited to attend any school meetings or parent-teacher conferences. We thus want to make sure that the rebuttable presumption is a part of this legislation because, at least at the beginning of most cases, the agency's duty is to reunify the family. While their rights are intact, parents should have the option to be involved in these very important decisions for the child.

**Chair Sprinkle:**

I will open the hearing up for questions.

**Assemblywoman Nguyen:**

I was shocked to find out from my fellow Assembly members who are teachers and educators and thus on the front line, that education was not even part of the discussion about foster youth. I appreciate your proposing this clarifying language in this bill to make it abundantly clear that educational information will be turned over. Do you think the bill will help facilitate getting that information from the various school districts?

**Bailey Bortolin:**

That is the goal behind A.B. 156. I would like to put on the record that the intent is that this person will be identified for the school districts and for the schools. It is not laid out specifically in the bill how that is going to happen. I believe it may be better to prepare a memorandum of understanding answering this question with the counties, given that Washoe and Clark Counties operate so differently. But the intent is, as Stephanie Cook alluded to, to make sure that the schools are aware who the appropriate person is, so that we can increase the communication between all parties.

**Assemblywoman Titus:**

For clarification, under section 1 [subsection 2, paragraph (a), subparagraph (4)], you use the language "An educational decision maker appointed for the child pursuant to" *Nevada Revised Statutes* 432B.462. I am wondering, does this mean that a decision will be as to whether the child needs someone appointed or whether this is not necessary as there is somebody out there close to the child able and willing to make decisions for and with the child? Or does this mean that every child gets someone appointed monitoring her or him as long as she or he is in the system, irrespective of the personal situation of that child?

**Bailey Bortolin:**

The bill is in this respect modeled according to a similar situation which we have in the law relating to children with special educational needs. In such special needs situations, we can appoint a surrogate parent. The bill suggests something similar for every child in child welfare. The intent is that every time a child's case is being reevaluated by a judge—every time there is a court hearing on a child's case—we reevaluate whether or not the person dealing with the educational needs of the child is the appropriate person for that. The rebuttable presumption is therefore that this person is the parent. But if the child is lingering in care and both parents' rights have been terminated, oftentimes there is confusion about who is making the educational decisions. In such situations, when the child is lingering in care and there is the risk that no one will end up making decisions relating to the educational needs of the child, the bill serves to ensure that there is always someone looking out for the child's educational needs, and that the conversation about these needs is being continued.

**Assemblywoman Titus:**

Since I am not an attorney and I do not do the welfare cases, my next question is a general one. Do children in child welfare get more than the educational help? Do they also get a health care advocate and a mental health advocate appointed? In other words, who is taking care of the rest of the farm?

**Stephanie Cook:**

As the legal guardian of the child, the child welfare agency would be making the majority of those other decisions. The specific issue with respect to making educational decisions is, however, that there is a potential conflict of interest if that involves working with the school district. For example, Washoe County social workers are employees of Washoe County—and so is everyone working for the Washoe County School District. When it comes to making decisions about what is in the best interest of the child educationally, a county employee would thus be approving what another county employee is suggesting. The solution we suggest to this potential conflict of interest is similar to the one found for certain situations in which a child is receiving psychiatric care. In these situations, a person has to be nominated and appointed by the court to make decisions related to the child's psychiatric care. Studies have shown that children who are in foster care are more medicated than their non-foster care counterparts. So, to ensure that children are medicated appropriately for whatever their diagnoses are, the solution was found to have a separate person appointed by the courts. The bill suggests a similar solution to potential conflicts of interest in relation to educational decisions made for foster child youth. This is necessary given that we are seeing

such poor outcomes for foster care youth in education. We want to make sure that someone can keep their eye on that to try to attempt to level the playing field.

**Assemblywoman Duran:**

Thank you, these are very interesting statistics on foster youth. I have one concern—will there not be a penalty holding somebody accountable for what we are trying to do here? How can we ensure that there will be continued help for the child?

**Bailey Bortolin:**

We are trying to work collaboratively with the child welfare system to ensure that we are working through the kinks, that information is in Infinite Campus, and that we are able to pull that information from Infinite Campus. If there is a situation in which someone has neglected his or her obligations of information sharing, I believe we do have sufficient means under the current law to try to ensure that we can compel that information.

**Kelly Venci Gonzalez:**

I would like to add, if the person is not compliant or diligent in his or her responsibilities, the court would review that and presumably appoint another person at that point. There is thus a mechanism in the law as it exists to ensure that the persons appointed are faithful and diligent and carrying out their responsibilities.

**Assemblywoman Gorelow:**

Since you are appointing someone to help these children through the educational process, how much input does the child have? Obviously, younger children would not have as much, but do some of your teenagers have any input on, for example, how to do their credit recovery or what school they might attend?

**Kelly Venci Gonzalez:**

Children over the age of 14 should be involved in their IEPs. In fact, they should be a part of it and should help in drafting it. The same is true for case plan development. The older the children are, the more they should have a say in the school they will attend, how they will obtain credits if they need credit recovery, what their goals are, and what their plan of transitioning should look like. That is already built into the law for our teenagers and older kids.

**Assemblywoman Backus:**

I would like to add from a practical standpoint: a CAP attorney is the voice of the child in court. As Assemblyman Thompson indicated when he was referencing court-appointed special advocates (CASAs) in the previous bill hearing and their looking out for the best interest of the child, one thing that the last legislative session established for every foster care child in Clark County was to have counsel. We, the CAP attorneys, are that voice. So when we go to hearings and things are discussed, we can advocate on behalf of what our client desires.

**Stephanie Cook:**

In addition to that, I would like to mention from the perspective of a child's attorney that we are very much involved in education decisions and working with our clients on pretty much anything in their lives. When we meet with them on a monthly basis, we are checking with them regularly as to how school is going, if there are any supports that they think they would need, if they are struggling with a specific class, or if there are some social things going on in school. Then we touch base with the worker to try to collaborate and come up with some solutions as to how to solve those problems. So these are issues that would not only be discussed in these semiannual court hearings. We can always touch base with the child in the interim and touch base with the worker. As Ms. Bortolin has pointed out, in Washoe County we get a lot of information from our child welfare agency when it comes to education. We are getting a lot of what is being asked for in this bill already, as we have a good working relationship with our school district and our child welfare agency.

**Chair Sprinkle:**

Committee, do you have any other questions? [There was no response.] Is there anyone here wishing to come forward in support of A.B. 156?

**Lindsay Anderson, Director, Government Affairs, Washoe County School District:**

We are in support of this bill. You heard a lot about the many issues we are facing with our foster children, and we are really proud of the foster care system we have in the Washoe County School District, which wraps support around these students. We look forward to a more formal conversation about how we make sure the school knows when the educational decision maker is appointed and/or changed at any time. Since we are not a party to any of the court cases, sometimes schools are nervous and confused about potentially violating the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, when mom and dad come and the schools do not necessarily know the circumstances of the student and what information can or cannot be shared. A formal arrangement around communicating with the school, knowing who the educational decision maker is, would be really valuable. We have information, which is not known to everyone, about what programs we have at different schools and why a change in school may actually support the student in a better way. We look forward to being part of that conversation.

**Bradley Keating, Director, Government Relations, Clark County School District:**

We support A.B. 156. I would like to echo the comments that were made by my colleague, Ms. Anderson, from Washoe County. We had a great opportunity in 2017 through Chair Sprinkle, who brought us together with our agencies across the counties in the state to work on ensuring that our students are getting proper services. We worked closely with the Department of Family Services in Clark County. Tim Burch is here today as their Administrator of Human Services. We are happy to work with him and his team to provide that access. Infinite Campus currently has access to all the things being requested in the bill. We are happy to make sure that this is provided and will continue to give all the information we need so that we can benefit these students every day.

**Brigid J. Duffy, Chief Deputy District Attorney, Juvenile Division, Office of The District Attorney, Clark County:**

On behalf of the attorneys that represent the Clark County Department of Family Services, I would like to state that we support A.B. 156. I would like to take one minute to say something positive. I have worked in the system for 19 years. That testimony about how terrible our system is—that was pretty harsh. But I am proud that we had an 85 percent graduation rate or high school equivalency diploma rate for the 2017-2018 school year. That is a big accomplishment which went unsaid, yet it is the result of the hard work of the agencies. It is also the result of Legal Aid, which has done a great job holding people accountable and making sure that education is not forgotten. But when you go into court hearings on child welfare cases, you will see that they can be chaotic. You have parents' attorneys, one for each parent; you have children's attorneys, CASA, the agency and agency attorneys—as a result, things get forgotten and courts get overwhelmed. The fact that we have people standing up to remind the court, Hey, let us talk about education—that is important. Right now, we are over here talking about how we get mom and dad sober so we can get the kids home. Sometimes, over this, education is being forgotten. We are thus happy to be partnering with Legal Aid, and we thank them for listening to our concerns.

A question arose, Who holds us accountable? The answer is that the courts hold us accountable. If the Department of Health and Human Services is not doing what it is ordered to do by the court, the child's attorney can file a motion to find us in contempt; the court can find us in contempt and hold us accountable. There are also federal requirements of accountability for reasonable efforts. All that is in place. But we do support this bill, because anybody who is out there helping us look out for the education of our children and making it better for them is important to us.

**Michael Flores, Chief of Staff, Nevada System of Higher Education:**

We are in support of A.B. 156. During the 2017-2018 Interim, there were conversations about having NSHE involved in this legislation. We are grateful to work with the stakeholders on this, because in the 2017-2018 Interim our Board of Regents passed a policy that allows all foster youth or former foster youth access to any of our institutions for free through a tuition fee waiver. We worked with the different counties, stakeholders, and Legal Aid on this policy. The initiative for this actually came from Senator Cancela, who reached out to us and who has worked with foster youth and really wanted to make sure we are doing more. We are happy to work with her and other stakeholders on this piece of policy so that we can make sure we are supporting our foster youth once they get out of high school. We are thus in full support and would like to put this on the record.

**Chair Sprinkle:**

Is there anyone wishing to come forward in support in southern Nevada? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in northern or southern Nevada wishing to come forward under opposition to this bill? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in northern or southern Nevada wishing to come forward as neutral? [There was no one.]

**Bailey Bortolin:**

Thank you all for your time and for hearing A.B. 156. I would like to state for the record that the bill is meant to be an added extra support. We understand that the system is overburdened and that the jobs that everyone has are very difficult. We are trying to find ways to provide that additional support. I really hope that what was said today did not come across as pointing fingers at anyone. We appreciate the hard work of the child welfare system, and we hope to find ways to continually support and improve it. [([Exhibit H](#)) was submitted but not discussed and will become part of the record.]

**Chair Sprinkle:**

Thank you for bringing this bill forward. I will close the hearing on A.B. 156. I will open it up for public comment. Is there anyone wanting to come forward in northern or southern Nevada? [There was no one.] The meeting is adjourned [at 2:47 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Christian Thauer  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblyman Richard Carrillo, Vice Chair

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

## EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

[Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster.

[Exhibit C](#) is a document titled "Model Coordinated Response Protocol & Toolkit To Address The Commercial Sexual Exploitation Of Children In Nevada," written by The Nevada Coalition To Prevent The Commercial Sexual Exploitation Of Children, submitted by Ross E. Armstrong, Administrator, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services; and Co-Chair, Nevada Coalition to Prevent the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children.

[Exhibit D](#) is a document titled "Strategic Plan To Address The Commercial Sexual Exploitation Of Children In Nevada," written by The Nevada Coalition To Prevent The Commercial Sexual Exploitation Of Children, submitted by Ross E. Armstrong, Administrator, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services; and Co-Chair, Nevada Coalition to Prevent the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children.

[Exhibit E](#) Is a document titled "Prevention Resource Guide To Address The Commercial Sexual Exploitation Of Children In Nevada," written by The Nevada Coalition To Prevent The Commercial Sexual Exploitation Of Children, submitted by Ross E. Armstrong, Administrator, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services; and Co-Chair, Nevada Coalition to Prevent the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children.

[Exhibit F](#) is a proposed amendment to [Assembly Bill 156](#), submitted by Bailey Bortolin, representing Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada; and Washoe Legal Services.

[Exhibit G](#) is written testimony in support of [Assembly Bill 156](#), submitted by Kelly Venci Gonzalez, Staff Attorney, Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada.

[Exhibit H](#) is a fact sheet entitled "8th Judicial District Hearing Quality Data Summary 2017," dated September 2018, submitted by Bailey Bortolin, representing Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada; and Washoe Legal Services.