

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY**

**Eightieth Session
February 26, 2019**

The Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chairman Steve Yeager at 8:05 a.m. on Tuesday, February 26, 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.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Chairman
Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen, Vice Chairwoman
Assemblywoman Shea Backus
Assemblyman Skip Daly
Assemblyman Chris Edwards
Assemblyman Ozzie Fumo
Assemblywoman Alexis Hansen
Assemblywoman Lisa Krasner
Assemblywoman Brittney Miller
Assemblywoman Rochelle T. Nguyen
Assemblywoman Sarah Peters
Assemblyman Tom Roberts
Assemblywoman Jill Tolles
Assemblywoman Selena Torres
Assemblyman Howard Watts

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod, Assembly District No. 34



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst
Bradley A. Wilkinson, Committee Counsel
Karyn Werner, Committee Secretary
Melissa Loomis, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Barbara K. Cegavske, Secretary of State
Wayne Thorley, Deputy Secretary for Elections, Office of the Secretary of State
Gail J. Anderson, Deputy Secretary for Southern Nevada, Office of the Secretary of State
Kimberley Perondi, Deputy Secretary for Commercial Recordings, Office of the Secretary of State
Erin M. Houston, Administrator, Securities Division, Office of the Secretary of State
Bailey Bortolin, representing Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada
Xavier Planta, Deputy Directing Attorney, Children's Attorneys Project, Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada
John T. Jones, Jr., representing Clark County
David Boire, representing Children's Advocacy Alliance
Kendra G. Bertschy, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's Office
Susan Meuschke, Executive Director, Nevada Coalition to END Domestic and Sexual Violence
Cristina Hernandez, Director, Jean Nidetch Women's Center, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Ashley Yuill, Assistant Director, Jean Nidetch Women's Center, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Holly Ramella, CARE Coordinator, Jean Nidetch Women's Center, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Kellie Harry, Victim Services Legal Advocate, Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe
Chuck Callaway, Police Director, Office of Intergovernmental Services, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Michael Flores, Chief of Staff, Nevada System of Higher Education
Anthony Ruiz, Senior Advisor for Government Relations and Community Affairs, Office of the President, Nevada State College
Celeste Ainsley, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
John J. Piro, Deputy Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Clark County Public Defender's Office

Chairman Yeager:

[Roll was called. Committee protocol and rules were explained.] We have a quorum. We have three items on the agenda today. We will take the items in the order that they are agendized. At this time, I will open the presentation by the Office of the Secretary of State. The presentation is on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS) ([Exhibit C](#)).

Barbara K. Cegavske, Secretary of State:

Joining me is my elections deputy, Wayne Thorley. We also have other deputy secretaries who will help present in Las Vegas. I will turn it over to Wayne Thorley to continue our presentation ([Exhibit C](#)).

Wayne Thorley, Deputy Secretary for Elections, Office of the Secretary of State:

The Office of the Secretary of State is one of the original constitutional offices established in the *Nevada Constitution* [page 2]. It is responsible for maintaining the official records of the acts of the Nevada Legislature and the Executive Branch of government. Additional duties have been added over time and range from the chief officer of elections, to recording of business entities filings, to appointing notaries public, to administrator of the Uniform Securities Act.

On page 3, you will see a list of the various boards and commissions that the Secretary of State serves on. I will not go through each one individually.

The Office of the Secretary of State is organized into eight main divisions: Commercial Recordings, Nevada Business Portal, Document Preparation Services Program/Domestic Partnership Registry/Registry for Advance Directives (Living Will Lockbox), Executive Administration, Elections, Notary, Operations, and Securities [page 4]. Our offices are located in Carson City in the Capitol Building, in the Meyers Annex that is across the street from the Capitol, and in the Blasdel Building just behind the Capitol. Our Las Vegas office is in the North Las Vegas City Hall building. In-person customer services are available in the Carson City offices and the North Las Vegas office. The services provided include picking up forms and paying fees.

On page 5, you will see our current staffing levels. The Secretary of State's Office has 138 positions. The number of positions assigned to each division can be seen on the slide.

The Office of the Secretary of State serves as a collector of various fees, fines, and penalties [page 6]. These range from filing and licensing fees with the Commercial Recordings Division, to broker license fees with the Securities Division, to candidate filing fees with the Elections Division. The majority of the revenue collected by the Office of the Secretary of State goes to support the State General Fund. In fiscal year (FY) 2018, the office collected revenue of \$218.6 million. Of that total, \$218.1 million, or 99.8 percent, went to the General Fund. This places the Office of the Secretary of State as the third-highest General Fund revenue-generating agency in the state.

Page 7 shows a pie chart breakdown by division of the General Fund revenue collected by our office for FY 2018. You can see that the largest General Fund revenue generators in the office are by far the Commercial Recordings Division at 85.3 percent and the Securities Division at 13.5 percent. Together, the Commercial Recordings Division and the Securities Division make up 98.8 percent of the total General Fund revenue collected by our office in FY 2018. The remaining 1.4 percent came from Uniform Commercial Code fees, the Notary Division, and the Elections Division.

Page 8 lists some of the fees and penalties collected by our office, the dollar amount or range of the fee, and the statutory authority under which the office collects the fee. This is not an exhaustive list, but this is the main list of fees and penalties that we collect.

The summary of the Securities Division is on page 9. The Securities Division regulates investment activities and enforces the state's securities laws, which are found in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 90. Duties of the Securities Division also include registration of securities offerings; licensing of investment advisors, broker-dealers, and athletes' agents; performing compliance inspections and investigations; criminal investigations; and investor education. The Securities Division is the highest General Fund revenue-producing division within the Office of the Secretary of State behind the Commercial Recordings Division. Annual General Fund revenue collected by the Securities Division totaled \$28.3 million in FY 2017 and \$29.3 million in FY 2018.

The Office of the Secretary of State also administers SilverFlume, which is Nevada's business portal [page 10]. SilverFlume—which is designed to be a first-stop shop for business-to-government filings and licensing transactions—supports nearly 500,000 business transactions annually. SilverFlume's partners include 14 state agencies, 27 local government agencies, and 58 regulatory agencies.

The Commercial Recordings Division is responsible for accepting, filing, maintaining, and providing public access to the organizational and mandatory documents of business entities organized under the laws of Nevada [page 11]. The Division also registers trademarks, service marks, trade names, and rights of publicity. It is responsible for issuing the annual state business license to business entities. Business entities that are required to file with the Commercial Recordings Division include corporations, limited liability companies, limited partnerships, limited liability limited partnerships, business trusts, and professional corporations and associations.

The table on page 12 lists the total number of business entities with active registration status with the Office of the Secretary of State. As you can see from the table, the majority of the business entities on file with our office are organized as either corporations or limited liability companies. In total, approximately 322,000 active business entities were on file as of January 2019. Additionally, there were over 43,000 sole proprietor and partnership business licenses on file with our office.

The Notary Division [page 13] is responsible for appointing, training, and disciplining notaries public, authenticating documents known as apostilles to be submitted to foreign countries in accordance with The Hague Convention of 1961, and maintaining a list of qualified ministers in Nevada who have been licensed by the state's county clerks. They also conduct training classes for prospective notaries public, including administration of online notary training. The Division also enforces the state's notary laws found in NRS Chapter 240. It administers the state's digital signature laws. Currently there are over 25,000 registered notaries public serving the residents of Nevada.

The Office of the Secretary of State administers the domestic partnership registrations, the Nevada Lockbox filings, and document preparation services [page 14]. The domestic partnership in Nevada is a civil contract that grants domestic partners the same rights, protections, benefits, responsibilities, obligations, and duties as parties to any other civil contract. The Office of the Secretary of State files and maintains all domestic partnership registrations and terminations.

The Nevada Lockbox serves as a free online storage for advance health care directives such as living wills, durable powers of attorney for health care decisions, do-not-resuscitate orders, and guardianship nomination forms. Once filed with the Nevada Lockbox, these documents can be accessed online by registrants, authorized health care professionals, family members when medical treatment decisions must be made, or by the courts in determining guardianship.

The Document Preparation Service Registration Program was created by Assembly Bill 74 of the 77th Session. Document preparation service providers are individuals, excluding licensed attorneys, who provide assistance to clients in certain legal matters. The Office of the Secretary of State registers document preparation service providers, regulates their business practices, receives bonds, investigates violations, and authorizes disciplinary action and other remedies. The program has been operational for approximately 4 1/2 years and, at the close of FY 2018, 870 document preparation service providers were registered with our office, which was up from 274 just two years ago. At the end of January of this year, we had 1,257 document preparation service-approved registrants.

The areas of the office that normally come before this Committee relate to the Commercial Recordings Division, the Securities Division, and the SilverFlume Nevada Business Portal [page 15]. We are currently in the final stages of testing and implementing a rewrite of our commercial recordings processing system and notary registration systems. We expect to go live later this spring with that program. As part of this project, we have contracted with Opportunity Village to digitize the historical business entity records currently held on microfilm. This will allow for a digital archive and increased access to these records. We continue increasing the reach of SilverFlume, Nevada's business portal. This includes the implementation of the women's survey and resource pages for women-, minority-, and veteran-owned businesses which are part of legislation passed last session. We are in the comment stages of draft regulations relating to investment advisor fiduciary duties.

The Office of the Secretary of State has one piece of proposed legislation [page 16] that will be before this Committee, but we are also monitoring various other pieces of legislation. Senate Bill 45, which has been heard in Senate Judiciary, is the only piece of legislation proposed by our office that will come before this Committee. It makes some clarifying changes related to when a person is considered not doing business in Nevada for the purposes of the state business license, and makes some changes related to records and custodians of records for certain business entities to conform to changes made last legislative session. We will also be monitoring legislation coming through this Committee that affects our office.

As always, we welcome any questions or discussions of this or any other legislation. We appreciate hearing beforehand if there are any concerns, questions, or proposed legislation related to the functions of the Office of the Secretary of State.

Barbara Cegavske:

Thank you for listening to our presentation, and we will now take any questions or comments that the Committee may have.

Assemblywoman Backus:

I really like knowing about the lockbox and I am glad you told us how many people upload to it. Are you doing any outreach in the community to make individuals aware of the lockbox? If so, what would they be?

Gail J. Anderson, Deputy Secretary for Southern Nevada, Office of the Secretary of State:

I oversee the staff with the Nevada Lockbox program. I am also very hands-on involved with the outreach part of the lockbox program.

Our office has information on our website and brochures. We go out anytime our office participates in a business event in the southern and northern communities, and we take material, like our brochures. We have made ourselves available to do public presentations to community and civic groups, Rotary clubs, and various entities. We do a presentation on the lockbox and try to assist people with understanding what it is and what it offers to them. The lockbox does not have designated funding, so we do not do advertising other than what we can do through all of the outreach efforts of our office. In fact, when Secretary Cegavske goes out to do speaking engagements, either I am with her or she takes brochures with her of the different aspects of our program. That is what we primarily do for outreach, and we are happy to participate wherever we can to let people know about this opportunity.

Assemblywoman Torres:

What has the Office of the Secretary of State done to ensure that their forms are provided in foreign languages?

Gail Anderson:

I am not sure if you are referring to the lockbox forms or our office forms.

Assemblywoman Torres:

I am specifically talking about forms for opening a business.

Kimberley Perondi, Deputy Secretary for Commercial Recordings, Office of the Secretary of State:

All of our forms are available online, and a lot of the browser settings can convert them into a foreign language. That is probably not what you are looking for. We also have internal people who speak different languages and can help interpret the forms. We are working on our new system and, as part of that, we are looking at creating both versions online.

Assemblywoman Torres:

Given that we have such a diverse state, I think it is important to have these forms available in foreign languages. I see this as a barrier to opening a business within my own district and within my own family. I think this needs to be an issue of urgency.

Barbara Cegavske:

That is the rewrite of the project that we were talking about in the Commercial Recordings Division. We are working on it. We will make sure it is translated.

Assemblyman Watts:

My question is about commercial recordings, securities, and investigations. I am trying to get some clarity regarding what things are handled within the Office of the Secretary of State. When does the Office of the Attorney General get involved regarding fraud or investigating when businesses stop filing but continue to operate? Is there anything that is proactively done, or is it just reacting when complaints are filed by outside parties?

Kimberley Perondi:

The Commercial Recordings Division has a compliance investigator, and we take a look at every complaint that is received. We do investigate complaints. The two typical types of complaints are compliance issues, where they are not licensed, or forged and fraudulent documents. There is a very heavy investigation that goes on. When we look at that, if we decide there may be criminal activity, we refer it to the Securities Division that has criminal investigators on staff. If it goes to that point, they look into it on the criminal side, and then we make a determination whether it gets referred to the Office of the Attorney General.

Erin M. Houston, Administrator, Securities Division, Office of the Secretary of State:

We have a total of four criminal investigators. When we receive referrals from any of the divisions, those investigators have the authority—they are sworn peace officers—to generate reports that are referred to the Attorney General or other law enforcement agencies. It is usually the Attorney General, however. The prosecution is at the discretion of the Attorney General's Office.

Chairman Yeager:

I would like to know more about the partnership with Opportunity Village and your digitizing some of the prior records. I would also like to know what the time frame looks like for completion.

Kimberley Perondi:

The contract that we have with Opportunity Village is for them to take the records of the Commercial Recordings Division that are dated prior to 2005, all the way back to 1874, and convert them to digital images, which would then be available online through our new system. The contract was signed about a month ago, and it lasts until June. They are scanning all of those documents and then indexing them. The secondary phase will be to work with our vendor on the e-SoS rewrite project to put them into the system and link them.

Chairman Yeager:

It sounds like a great project. I am happy to hear about it. Obviously, having those records digitized is going to be a great benefit to the communities. I encourage you to keep looking for opportunities like that to make these things more user-friendly. We will be in touch and will see you in a couple of months on that Senate bill.

I am now going to open the hearing on the first bill on the agenda, Assembly Bill 126.

Assembly Bill 126: Enacts provisions governing the procedures for changing the name of an unemancipated minor who is in the legal custody of a child welfare agency. (BDR 3-402)

Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod, Assembly District No. 34:

In 2017 I sponsored Assembly Bill 232 of the 79th Session, which passed both houses unanimously. The purpose of Assembly Bill 126 is merely to add a procedure in which an unemancipated minor who is in the custody of an agency can make a name change. There was an amendment offered by Clark County (Exhibit D), which we consider a friendly amendment, and we are happy to work with them. I will have my colleague down south go into detail about the bill.

Bailey Bortolin, representing Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada:

We worked with the Assemblywoman last session to create a minor name-change process separate from that of the adults. With the best of intentions, we accidentally left out our clients who are children in the foster care system. We want them to also have the ability to use the minor name-change process.

Xavier Planta, Deputy Directing Attorney, Children's Attorneys Project, Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada:

I am the deputy directing attorney at the Children's Attorneys Project (CAP) at the Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada (Exhibit E). Our program represents children who have been removed from their homes due to physical, emotional, or sexual abuse; abandonment; or where parents' substance abuse, lack of resources, or mental health adversely affects the

parents' ability to care for their child. In my ten years as a child's attorney, it is rare for a child in foster care to want or desire to change his name. If you were to take an informal survey of the attorneys in my office, they would say the same. However, when a child wishes to change his name, it is a carefully considered, well-thought-out, monumental decision for the child. Often it is that the child wishes not to be reminded of his traumatic past; the child was named after a parent whom he has never met or with whom he has no relationship; the child's parent committed fraud using the child's name; the child's name was misspelled on his birth certificate; he was named after a drug or alcoholic beverage, or some other unusual name; or a transgendered child desires a name that reflects his or her true identity. For these children, the sad reality is that there are often no parents to file a petition or consent to the name change. As it was stated, while A.B. 232 of the 79th Session established specific procedures for a parent to petition the court to change a child's name, it did not address the name-change process for a child in foster care.

I am here today to support A.B. 126, which outlines the procedure for changing the name of a child in foster care. The bill authorizes an attorney representing an unemancipated minor in the legal custody of an agency to file a petition to change the name of the child. It also outlines the required disclosures in the minor's name-change petition, including the reason for the change, the verified consent of any parent who consents to the name change, and whether the minor has been convicted of a felony. It also provides clear guidelines for notifying parents who have not consented to the name change.

There is a provision that allows the petitioner to file a motion to seek waiver of the notice requirement to the parent. This might apply in rare circumstances where the child has been sexually abused; cases involving a child's death; or where the child has been physically abused and that child now fears for his safety and does not wish for the parents to know about the name change. These are cases where the likelihood of reunification is slim to none, or where the parents' rights have been terminated. This is a request that requires the filing of a motion, which is heard by the court. Ultimately, it is the court that must grant the motion. Absent those circumstances, I would anticipate the court requiring notice to the parents. Finally, the court will weigh the reasons for the name change as indicated in the petition, and it must approve the unemancipated minor's name change if it determines that the name change is in the minor's best interest.

I want to end my testimony with a comment made by Maurice Merleau-Ponty in *Consciousness and the Acquisition of Language*. In that, he states that the child's own name becomes above all a movement that signifies an attempt to mark the child's place beside others. In other words, the child makes use of his own name as a power play in order to become a significant member of the community. Today I would argue that being able to change one's name empowers that child and creates a new narrative for himself as he attempts to navigate his place in society despite very difficult and traumatic events. I would urge the Committee to support the passing of A.B. 126.

Chairman Yeager:

Is there any additional testimony, or would you like me to open it for questions?

Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod:

Open it for questions.

Assemblywoman Cohen:

Section 3, subsection 2, paragraph (d) says that there is a consent requirement from the child. I understand the age of 14 and over; that is a common age of consent in family law statutes. What is envisioned for a 12-year-old? What if a 12-year-old does not consent?

Xavier Planta:

It is on a case-by-case basis. It depends on the circumstances. These are well-thought-out requests made by the child. With a 12-year-old child, it may apply when there are no parents involved, or when the parents' rights have been terminated. The child requests the name change. In making the request through the attorney, at that point they would provide their consent. Does that answer your question?

Bailey Bortolin:

Because children's attorneys represent 100 percent of the children in the foster care system, this petition is specific to that children's attorney being able to file a petition. Children's attorneys are not guardians; they act at the desires of the children. We will only bring a petition if the child requests the name change. I believe the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) added the 14-year-and-up language because it is standard family law procedure. We must have written consent of any child 14 years and older for any action we request for the child. We will not bring a petition for a 12-year-old that does not consent because it is at the request of the child.

Assemblywoman Cohen:

Maybe we could have that removed because it makes it confusing.

Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod:

Thank you. I think that is a great idea, and I will bring that up with LCB.

Assemblywoman Backus:

My question is for Mr. Planta. I am one of your CAP attorneys on a pro-bono basis. For clarity for people who may not know this, when a child comes into the system and the parental rights are terminated and the child is adopted, more often than not, do the adoptive parents have the right to change the child's name through the court system at another time?

Xavier Planta:

Yes, that is correct.

Assemblywoman Backus:

Most of the time, when it is the limited situation where there may be a need for a name change, could that also be to correct the spelling of the child's name? Children often utilize one spelling of their name, but the birth certificate does not represent the correct spelling.

Xavier Planta:

That is correct. Rarely does a child wish to change her name, but I have had circumstances where the child's name was misspelled and she had been going by the way she thought it should have been spelled. On the birth certificate it was misspelled but never corrected. She requested the change, and, unfortunately, the way the law is currently written, it did not allow her to petition to change her name, so we had to wait until she was 18 years old. It was a source of frustration for her, especially as she was transitioning into adulthood and trying to gather all of her documents for transition out of care.

Assemblywoman Tolles:

I remember college and participating in a psychology class during which I had to sit in on a support group for survivors of child abuse. There was a day of celebration for one of the members who had been approved to change his name as part of the process of breaking free and establishing a new identity. I can appreciate the value of this bill.

Section 3, subsection 2, paragraph (h) states, "Whether the minor has been convicted of a felony." What is the reason, and can they still change their name? Can you explain the inclusion of that paragraph? The reason it stood out to me is that I know there is a common practice of exploited youths—in particular the area of sex trafficking—where the exploiter will use the system to have them change their name so he can continue to exploit them under a new name and be less likely to have the proper follow-up through the system.

Bailey Bortolin:

Previously, when we created the minor name-change process last session, there was only one name-change statute. It was built for adults trying to defraud creditors; that was how we read it. You had to disclose all of that information because you may have a lot of debt that you are trying to get away from by changing your name. When we created the process for a minor, we got feedback that it would still be important to have the information about a child's criminal record for a proper-notice requirement if necessary. I believe it will be a factor for the court to consider, and they will still make the determination if it is in the best interest of the child. In that way, we would have all of the information for anyone who may need to know that the minor is changing his name.

Assemblywoman Tolles:

I appreciate that it would still create a record. I want to make sure we are keeping protections in consideration, and it sounds like we are.

My other question relates to section 4, subsection 2, paragraph (a), where we would publish notice in a newspaper of general circulation. We had a lot of name-change bills; I had a name-change bill last session. I know this is part of the standard procedure regarding name changes. That stood out to me, so I want to ensure that the minors are protected. I am concerned that it would advertise and highlight that there is a vulnerable youth changing his name. If I read it correctly, section 3 says that it is up to the court to waive that requirement. I want to make sure I am reading that correctly, and there is a remedy for that concern.

Bailey Bortolin:

That is a process that we use across many areas of law, one of which is child welfare. When we are unable to locate parents, we still have to provide the due process of trying to locate them. The legal procedure is publication, so we often use it as a means to provide notice to parents in our existing child welfare statutes. We do believe that the catchall may be necessary to allow the court to make a best-interest determination if there is an exception that needs to be made for a child who has been severely abused, or there is a trauma or safety reason why we would not want the parents to know the new name or to locate the child based on the name change. If there is a true safety concern, we would seek the motion from the court to allow the judge to determine if it is in the best interest of the child to skip that publication requirement.

Assemblyman Roberts:

The bill looks like it is needed, but I have a procedural question to help me understand. Section 6 in the Legislative Counsel's Digest section talks about child welfare proceedings. You also talked about child welfare proceedings when children are in custody. The digest says, "or in an action concerning divorce, child custody, the establishment of parentage, the termination of parental rights." From a procedural standpoint, how does that work? I am not familiar with the process, so please explain how that works in those circumstances.

Bailey Bortolin:

If we represent a child who is in child welfare, we may also file in one of those enumerated chapters. If there is not an open NRS Chapter 432B case—but there may be an open custody case—it may be filed under one of those other chapters. I believe that is where a minor in the child welfare system may petition, but that may need clarification from legal since I do not represent those children.

Assemblyman Roberts:

Could legal weigh in on the explanation of that? There is nothing that talks about that language, and I am trying to figure out how that works.

Bradley A. Wilkinson, Committee Counsel:

The language in section 6 is patterned after the existing language for name changes of unemancipated minors. As stated, this would be something that you would do in the context of a divorce or child custody action. Instead of following the exact publication procedures that you have under the bill, you would follow whatever procedures exist under that custody case.

Chairman Yeager:

I see no additional questions at this time. I will open it up for testimony in support of A.B. 126 if there is anyone who would like to testify in support.

John T. Jones, Jr., representing Clark County:

I am wearing my Clark County hat this morning. I am here to thank Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod for accepting the amendment ([Exhibit D](#)) that Clark County proposed to A.B. 126. What the amendment does is strike the consent required of an agency that provides child welfare services from section 3 and section 5 of the bill. The child welfare agency has no interest nor authority to weigh in on this issue.

David Boire, representing Children's Advocacy Alliance:

We support this bill.

Chairman Yeager:

Is there anyone in Las Vegas who wants to testify in support? I do not see anyone, so we will take opposition to the bill.

Kendra G. Bertschy, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's Office:

Overall, I think this is a very good bill. Our only concern is that the Washoe County Public Defender's Office represents parents who are involved in foster care dependency cases. Our concern is section 4, subsection 3, regarding the waiver of the notice. This still pertains to parents who have their parental rights intact. I think this has some constitutional implications. It is my understanding that we will be working with Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod on an amendment to clarify this issue.

Chairman Yeager:

Is there anyone else in opposition to Assembly Bill 126? Seeing no other opposition, is there anyone who would like to testify neutral? I do not see anyone, so we will invite our presenters to make concluding remarks on the bill.

Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod:

I want to address the Washoe County Public Defender's Office's issue. I did say that I would work with them. That section of the bill is in there for children who may be victims of sexual exploitation or sexual abuse by the parent, and they do not want the parent to know the new name or where they are. As it is listed here, it would be the court that would make that determination. I would be happy if we could find a happy medium, but I do not want to see any children who are already vulnerable become more vulnerable by having to let their parents know everything. As I mentioned, I am happy to work with them if we can find some common ground, but I want you all to know the intent of that section and why it is necessary in my mind.

Xavier Planta:

My only additional comment was to address the concern about the notice requirement. We anticipate that it will apply in very rare circumstances, in extreme circumstances where the child has been sexually abused, or a child death, or where the child was severely physically abused. In representing children through these types of cases, they oftentimes have extreme fear of that parent or care provider who has committed these actions. That provision is

designed to protect these young children from that fear and from knowing that the parent would know who they are—their new name—and would be able to look them up. We anticipate this to be done only in rare circumstances and, ultimately, it is the court that makes the determination to waive that requirement.

Chairman Yeager:

I will now close the hearing on Assembly Bill 126. Moving along through the agenda, I will now open the hearing on the second bill listed, Assembly Bill 134. Assemblywoman Backus will present. She also has a lineup of folks who are going to help her present the bill, both here and in Las Vegas. We will let all of you get through your initial remarks on the bill, then we will open it for questions. As this presentation goes along, let me know if you have questions and we will ask them after the presentation is finished.

Assembly Bill 134: Revises provisions governing privileges. (BDR 4-694)

Assemblywoman Shea Backus, Assembly District No. 37:

I am pleased to be the sponsor of Assembly Bill 134. This bill is intended to revise existing law—which is codified at *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 49.2541 to 49.2549—that already provides privilege for confidential communication between a victim of domestic violence, sexual assault, or human trafficking and a victim's advocate from a nonprofit program that provides assistance. This bill extends the definition of "victim's advocate" to include a person who has had 20 hours of training and works, paid or unpaid, for a program through a university, state college, or community college within the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) or a program of a tribal organization. The bill setting forth the original privilege language was initially introduced in 2003 by former Speaker Barbara Buckley and was amended in 2017 to include human trafficking. Both times the entire Legislature supported the bills.

I have the privilege to be joined by experts in the field of victim advocacy for those victims of sexual assault, domestic violence, and human trafficking to provide testimony regarding A.B. 134. We are joined by Sue Meuschke, Executive Director of Nevada Coalition to END Domestic and Sexual Violence (NCEDSV), who will provide a general overview and introduction. We also have three women joining us from the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV) to provide additional information on the extension of privilege to victim advocates from a program of a university, state college, or community college within the Nevada System of Higher Education: Cristina Hernandez, Ashley Yuill, and Holly Ramella. Additionally, we have Kellie Harry to provide additional information—provided by Kimberly Lowery—on the extension of privilege to tribal organizations.

Susan Meuschke, Executive Director, Nevada Coalition to END Domestic and Sexual Violence:

I am the executive director of the Nevada Network Coalition to END Domestic and Sexual Violence, the statewide coalition of domestic and sexual violence programs in Nevada (Exhibit F). I am here today to speak in favor of A.B. 134. As you are aware, existing law establishes a privilege for confidential communication between a victim of domestic

violence, sexual assault, or human trafficking and a victim's advocate who works for a nonprofit program that provides assistance to such victims. This bill revises the definition of "victim's advocate" to include a person who works for a program of a university, state college, or community college within NSHE or a program of a tribal organization which provides such assistance.

In 2003, when we first passed the victim advocate privilege statute [Assembly Bill 160 of the 72nd Session], campuses did not have advocates, and we were not smart enough to include tribal advocates. In 2019, much has changed, and we hope we are much smarter. Currently there are five states that include campus advocates in their statute—Oregon, California, Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin—and there are five states that include tribal advocates—Oregon, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Washington, and Montana. We hope to join their ranks. We know there is a great need for confidential services in both areas. Approximately 20 to 25 percent of women and 15 percent of men attending college are victims of forced sex during their time in college, and 90 percent of sexual assault victims on college campuses do not report the assault. Also, 61 percent of American Indian and Alaska Native women have been assaulted, and 34 percent of all American Indian and Alaska Native women will be victims of rape in their lifetimes. Having campus advocates is making a real difference in a victim's decision to report or receive services on campus. We have three individuals who will speak to those issues. Native women experience violence from both native and non-native perpetrators. After an assault, we want to make sure that the survivor can access the services that are most comfortable. Our advocate from the Pyramid Lake Paiute Reservation will testify about their services and their need to have confidential communications. Each survivor has different service and support needs, but all need confidence that the advocate to whom they turn in crisis will be able to maintain their confidentiality. Without such confidence, victims may not feel safe in seeking services. We are asking for your support to protect confidentiality of communications on campuses and on tribal lands by passing A.B. 134.

Cristina Hernandez, Director, Jean Nidetch Women's Center, University of Nevada, Las Vegas:

I am the director of the Jean Nidetch Women's Center (JNWC) at UNLV ([Exhibit G](#)). I am here today to provide information as to why it is important for campus advocates to have the same privileges as community advocates. I have worked at UNLV for the last 11 years, and prior to that I worked at our local rape crisis center. The JNWC has been providing advocacy services for sexual assault, domestic or dating violence, stalking, and, most recently, sexual harassment since 2009. We are currently the only NSHE institution providing comprehensive, inclusive advocacy services. The CARE [Campus Advocacy Resource Empowerment] advocates who work in the JNWC, as well as the advocate staff, undergo 45 hours of relevant training to provide advocacy related to sexual assault, domestic or dating violence, stalking, or other gender-based discrimination. This means they are not required to report incidents of sexual harassment or assault, domestic or dating violence, stalking, or other gender-based discrimination. This allows students to get support and resources, hear about reporting options, accommodations, and other remedies before taking further action. It is critical that UNLV offer this confidential space to victims and survivors. In a recent

survey that we conducted with clients, 75 percent stated confidentiality was a factor in seeking services from the CARE advocates. Over the course of the last five years—2013 to 2018—we provided services to 403 victims or survivors in person and 458 victims or survivors over the phone. We provide safe and confidential space to connect with peers; trauma-informed support; crisis response; resources and connections to multiple services and options both on and off campus; information on Title IX, sexual misconduct policies and procedures and reporting options; information on criminal and civil legal options; and lastly, a CARE Survivor Fund that provides emergency funding to victims or survivors.

My colleagues, Ashley Yuill and Holly Ramella, will be discussing statistics and our trauma-informed practices. I will provide information on our peer-to-peer-based model and the need for confidentiality and privilege. A peer-to-peer advocacy model empowers clients and creates a welcoming space for those hesitant to share their story. Having peer advocates on college campuses to support one another when they experience interpersonal violence creates the sense that their voices are heard and that they do not have to carry that trauma alone. Hearing “I believe you” from someone who shares community with you can be extremely validating. We must continue our engagement in a trauma-informed approach as we strive to retain and advance students at the university level. We need protections for victim/survivor information and privacy, so that—regardless of leadership changes within the university, NSHE, or at the state or federal level—victim/survivors are consistently protected.

Major points of concern and need for protection of privacy, identity, and information include, for example, when a perpetrator’s attorney attempted to use a UNLV student’s records even after the perpetrator was found responsible—with privilege, the client would not need to fear utilizing our support services. When a university student reports university staff or a faculty member for sexual harassment and the staff or faculty member uses his position of power within the university to demand campus advocate client files, with privilege, the student’s records would remain safe from use in retaliation.

Our UNLV campus advocates undergo a minimum of 45 hours of victim advocacy training and certification process, which is among the most extensive training within the state, and equally qualifies campus advocates to hold confidentiality and privilege.

A notable argument against privilege and confidentiality states that a university student sues NSHE for failure to protect and to act when the student disclosed she was being abused by university staff, faculty, or another student. This is something that, as advocates, we can mitigate by including specific information on our intake forms.

Ashley Yuill, Assistant Director, Jean Nidetch Women's Center, University of Nevada, Las Vegas:

I am here today to provide information as to why it is important for campus advocates to have the same privileges as community advocates ([Exhibit H](#)). I have worked in the anti-violence field in Nevada for 11 years within an immigration office, a local domestic violence and rape crisis center, and now UNLV. National statistics have shown that 1 in

4 college women will be raped in their lifetime. Applying this statistic to UNLV, approximately 4,352 of the 17,406 female students, both undergraduates and graduates, have been or will be sexually assaulted in their lifetime. A special report from the U.S. Department of Justice says, "For the period 1995 to 2013, females ages 18 to 24 had the highest rate of rape and sexual assault victimizations compared to females in all other age groups. Within the 18 to 24 age group, victims could be identified as students enrolled in a college, university, trade school or vocational school or as nonstudents." It is clear that students need the support of confidential, campus-based advocates.

Although the NRS covers community victim advocates, it is dangerously incomplete. With the intentional inclusion of campus-based advocates, we will be able to provide confidential support to students who are victims or survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault. Providing confidential peer advocates means victims and survivors can disclose their experience and hear about options, resources, accommodations, and support services in order to develop trust and make informed choices. Without this key component, students are forced to share their experience with someone who has the ability to make decisions for them, which is in direct conflict of the trauma-informed approach. Help Nevada become a safer and more empowering state for university students experiencing domestic violence and sexual assault by ensuring they have access to a confidential support system: vote "Do pass" on A.B. 134.

Holly Ramella, CARE Coordinator, Jean Nidetch Women's Center, University of Nevada, Las Vegas:

I am the CARE Coordinator at JNWC at UNLV ([Exhibit I](#)). I am here today to provide insight into the importance of this bill and its direct impact on UNLV students. I have been an advocate at UNLV for the past four years and have become well versed in the needs of our students, specifically those who experience domestic or dating violence, sexual assault, harassment, and stalking, which is a high percentage.

Our peer advocate program, CARE Advocates, implements a trauma-informed theoretical framework in order to effectively retain students at UNLV. Trauma-informed services mean that we acknowledge how trauma impacts students, not just academically, but also physically, psychologically, financially, and more. This trauma-informed approach has been utilized by many different fields and has become an intrinsic part of the substance abuse and mental health services fields. The major components of the trauma-informed approach are peer support; safety; trustworthiness; transparency; collaboration; mutuality; empowerment; voice and choice; and cultural, historical, and gender issues. Maintaining these aspects requires confidentiality. Without confidentiality, students will not be empowered to access the services that are best for them. They will not have a choice as to who has access to their information, and their safety is at risk. Confidential services center the victims or survivors as the expert of their own life, push against power dynamics that accumulate when victims or survivors are forced to report or disclose to an office they do not feel comfortable with, and create a space where students can focus on healing. If students are not accessing our services, they are not able to receive holistic support to ensure their physical, mental, psychological, emotional, medical, and financial well-being. It is our duty as a university to

support students until graduation, and providing trauma-informed services is essential to this goal. Please help us provide the best advocacy possible to UNLV students and support them throughout their academic career by voting "Do pass" on A.B. 134.

Kellie Harry, Victim Services Legal Advocate, Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe:

I am here to share the testimony of two other tribal colleagues who work in the field. The first is from Clarice Charlie-Hubbard, who is the program director for the Family Violence Prevention Program for the Inter-Tribal Council of Nevada. This is her letter ([Exhibit J](#)):

I have the honor of working with two Violence Prevention Advocates with the Inter-Tribal Council of Nevada and many other Tribal Advocates who work in our Tribal communities across Nevada to prevent family and domestic violence and sexual assault. While our goal is prevention, we too often must help victims respond to and survive violence. As you are aware domestic violence and sexual assault are traumatic, frightening experiences. At times these are occurring between Native and non-Native Nevadans. It will be very helpful to our advocates to be certain that their communications with victim survivors in these situations can be confidential if that is the victim-survivor's desire. For many years the Native American voice and needs has not been prioritized. So I would like to thank you for hearing our needs, our concerns and including our Tribal voices in this important matter.

The second testimony is from Kim Lowery, who is the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe Sexual Assault Victim Services Advocate ([Exhibit K](#)). She wrote:

My name is Kim Lowery and I am the Sexual Assault Advocate for the Pyramid Lake Victim Services Program located within the boundaries of the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe Indian Reservation. I have worked with victim/survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault for almost 10 years now advocating for and with them during their participation with our program. We work in advocacy and education of victim/survivors with other agencies such as other DV/SA [Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault] programs, law enforcement and the judicial system. We work with Native and Non-Native victims within the State of Nevada from the beginning of their disclosure of their victimizations to being supportive and advocating on their behalf with law enforcement on and off the reservation. We believe that the communication between victims and advocates should be upheld by the victim/advocate privileged communication laws to ensure the victim/survivors confidentiality that we advise them of when entering the program unless they sign appropriate release forms. As you know domestic violence and sexual assault occurs often and we want to ensure their matters are kept as confidential as possible. If these laws are enacted off the reservation we can inform the victim/survivors that they have the same privilege that our Tribal DV Code ensures privileged communication.

Chairman Yeager:

I will open it up for questions from Committee members.

Assemblywoman Tolles:

Having taught at the University of Nevada, Reno for the last 13 years, I cannot tell you how many students have disclosed, and how important it is to recognize on the record that I have had not only females disclose, but males disclose as well. I think this will benefit our students tremendously, so thank you for bringing this forward.

Assemblywoman Cohen:

I am sorry if you covered this when I was not here earlier, but besides tribes and campuses, where else do you see victims' advocacy groups that this will effect?

Susan Meuschke:

Currently the legislation covers all nonprofit victim advocates who provide services to victims of domestic and sexual violence and trafficking. That is the current legislation. This piece of legislation would include campus advocates and tribal advocates.

Chairman Yeager:

Do we have any additional questions from Committee members? I do not see any. I will open it up for additional testimony in support of A.B. 134.

Chuck Callaway, Police Director, Office of Intergovernmental Services, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:

We are here in support.

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

We are in support of A.B. 134. We support increased advocacy and victim assistance and outreach to all victims of sexual assault, domestic violence, and trafficking, especially when it involves a student or employee within the Nevada System of Higher Education and our eight institutions.

Anthony Ruiz, Senior Advisor for Government Relations and Community Affairs, Office of the President, Nevada State College:

The Nevada State College is proud to serve a 78-percent-female population. Understanding that 1 in 4 women are victims of sexual assault at some point in their life, we are prepared to support them. Nevada State College is entering a time of expansion and is adding on-campus student housing. The passage of A.B. 134 will contribute to our confidence in building our prevention and response programs, similar to those at UNLV's women's center.

I want to draw attention to a letter submitted by a Nevada State College employee, Amey Evaluna ([Exhibit L](#)). Amey is an advisor to the Women's Services Coalition and A Voice for the Innocent project. She is also a survivor of domestic violence and sexual assault. Her comments have been submitted for the record, and she wanted to make a point that she was

able to make an anonymous call with a CARE advocate, which eventually led to her perpetrator being charged and convicted. Thank you for your consideration.

Celeste Ainsley, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am a CARE advocate and I have been one since August 2018. I am here to say that I support this bill.

Chairman Yeager:

Is there any other testimony in support? Seeing no additional testimony, we will take opposition testimony.

John J. Piro, Deputy Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Clark County Public Defender's Office:

We are here in opposition to this bill with a conceptual amendment that we spoke about with Assemblywoman Backus. We want to make it clear that we believe that confidentiality in providing a safe space for victims to go to disclose what has happened to them is supremely important. We would not want to touch it on the front end at all. There is a balance, however, once criminal charges are filed that needs to be struck.

Because of that, we want to talk about a potential conceptual amendment, and let me explain where this comes from since it is not something we are inventing. If you are a lawyer and you have client confidentiality, that client confidentiality can be waived if the lawyer and the client have a dispute with each other and it goes to court. It does not get waived before that, and only the client can waive it before then. Once you go to court and you are adversaries, that gets waived. It is the same as the doctor-patient relationship, which is written into the statute. This statute has none of the similar protections. If you go to your doctor and what you tell your doctor becomes an element in either a claim or a defense against a party, that is discoverable once the court process starts to take place. That is our concern with this bill.

Let me propose an example. Let us say someone goes to the victim's advocate after she had an unpleasant sexual experience—which is uncomfortable for me to talk about in this room, but these are the uncomfortable things that we need to talk about when we are creating policy—but she does not talk about it as rape. That does not say that she cannot go back to the advocate and talk about it later as rape. That may be something that is discoverable, and it is a point that will need to be brought up in the defense of this case if charges are later filed or descriptions differ as to what happened. That would be central to defending a case like this. That is the only time I believe the privilege should be waived: if charges are filed. If no charges are filed, confidentiality should remain throughout. The other privilege statutes allow for that, but this one does not. That is our concern with this bill.

Kendra G. Bertschy, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's Office:

Thank you for meeting with us to discuss our conceptual amendment and our concerns regarding this bill. We agree with what Mr. Piro indicated: this is a very delicate balance that needs to be struck because we want to make sure people are disclosing. However, we also need to protect the accused's rights because, at the point when a criminal proceeding is initiated, they are still presumed innocent and have constitutional rights that need to be followed. Again, we are following the other sections of the privilege document and will be providing that information to Assemblywoman Backus to hopefully create an amendment.

Chairman Yeager:

I want to make sure the record is clear. If we did not pass this bill at all, right now there is privilege for those who work for a nonprofit program. Your concerns discussed today apply regardless of whether this bill passes. Is that correct?

John Piro:

That is correct. We would want the entities they are trying to include included based on the need that they spoke about.

Chairman Yeager:

You are right to be in opposition to the bill. I wanted to make sure that was made clear. It is not that this bill is amplifying who would benefit from the privilege, and it is not changing the rules of the privilege that exists today in statute. I am not offering an opinion on that, but I want to make sure it is clear for the Committee.

I do not see any additional questions. Is there anyone else in opposition to A.B. 134? [There was no one.] Is there anyone neutral? I do not see anyone neutral, so I will invite the sponsor up to make closing remarks.

Assemblywoman Backus:

I want to address some of the concerns that were raised by the public defenders. As a practicing civil attorney, I understand accessing information in discovery. Unfortunately, during our conversation and having slept last night, I thought of some things. First, I want to reiterate the Chair's statement. How the law exists is that the exception that was raised is limited, mainly in medical malpractice where an issue comes to the surface. If a case is filed, a third party can gain access to medical records. That is not the case here. It is not an exception for nonprofits. If we do open it, it opens a lot of exceptions to existing law that was overwhelmingly supported in 2003 and 2017. I do not know that I feel comfortable looking back at the existing law.

The other thing I thought about—because I reread the testimony from SafeNest—were points made during the 2003 enactment of this statute. SafeNest offers victim advocates who may travel with the victim to court. If you end up making information available, like confidential communications, that privilege is raised. That means the victim advocate becomes a witness. The victim advocate can no longer sit by the victim during trial. There is a rule called a "victim exclusion rule." I use it sometimes in civil court. I leave witnesses outside of the courtroom, and they cannot be present. So this could have a ripple effect if the exception was expanded.

Also, I looked at the Pyramid Lake Tribal Law and Order Code, which is very extensive and includes another issue that Ms. Meuschke and I discussed this morning. One of the things that victim advocates know about is the whereabouts of victims. Right now, SafeNest has multiple locations that are confidential, and if we open up victim advocates to testifying, that information could then be made available to the public. That is one of the issues that was covered in the tribal code that I thought was fascinating.

Another thing that was highlighted was the simple cost. Subpoenas are made to secure records or subpoena a witness to testify. There is a cost that could be associated with securing that information, as well as time, and these are volunteers. We are hoping to keep these volunteers on campus providing their services.

Susan Meuschke:

We thank Assemblywoman Backus for bringing this bill and being such a big supporter. When we originally brought this bill back in 2003, it was after a case during which prosecutors were subpoenaing records. Judge Cherry, who worked on the district court at that time, made a decision that the interest of the community in protecting the confidentiality of these communications overrides any other consideration. That was where we came from. I hope we can stay there. As an advocate, I hear a lot of things from a lot of people. I do not know that the information would be helpful to any prosecution.

It would be difficult to recruit volunteers or to promise any victim that called that the information she shared with me would be confidential. That would effectively end the usefulness of the program. This is an important piece of legislation, and I hope you can look at it positively.

[Additional exhibits submitted but not discussed include written testimony in support from Hafid Acosta Gomez ([Exhibit M](#)), written testimony in support from Eden Alem ([Exhibit N](#)), and written testimony in support from Bibiana Lopez ([Exhibit O](#)).]

Chairman Yeager:

I will now close the hearing on Assembly Bill 134. We have reached the point on our agenda where we will take public comment. Is there anyone who would like to give public comment? Seeing no one, I will close public comment.

Is there anything from Committee members before we talk about the rest of the week? [There was nothing.] We will meet tomorrow at 8 a.m., and we have a couple of presentations from the Second and Eighth Judicial District Courts. Then we have two bills. It is the same for Thursday when we have two bills. Friday will also be at 8 a.m. with two bills. I will let you know if any of that changes. As you can see, we are scheduling bills as quickly as we can. I anticipate, over the next couple of weeks, that we will probably receive as many as 100 more bills for this Committee. We will continue to schedule these and hear as many of them as we can throughout the week.

The meeting is adjourned [at 9:29 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Karyn Werner
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Chairman

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is a copy of a PowerPoint presentation titled "Office of the Secretary of State Overview," presented by Wayne Thorley, Deputy Secretary for Elections, Office of the Secretary of State.

[Exhibit D](#) is a proposed amendment to Assembly Bill 126 presented by John T. Jones, Jr., representing Clark County.

[Exhibit E](#) is written testimony presented by Xavier Planta, Deputy Directing Attorney, Children's Attorneys Project, Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada, regarding Assembly Bill 126.

[Exhibit F](#) is written testimony presented by Susan Meuschke, Executive Director, Nevada Coalition to END Domestic and Sexual Violence, regarding support of Assembly Bill 134.

[Exhibit G](#) is written testimony presented by Cristina Hernandez, Director, Jean Nidetch Women's Center, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, regarding support of Assembly Bill 134.

[Exhibit H](#) is written testimony presented by Ashley Yuill, Assistant Director, Jean Nidetch Women's Center, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, regarding support of Assembly Bill 134.

[Exhibit I](#) is written testimony presented by Holly Ramella, CARE Coordinator, Jean Nidetch Women's Center, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, regarding support of Assembly Bill 134.

[Exhibit J](#) is written testimony authored by Clarice Charlie-Hubbard, Director, Family Violence Prevention Program, Inter-Tribal Council of Nevada, dated February 22, 2019, regarding support of Assembly Bill 134, presented by Kellie Harry, Victim Services Legal Advocate, Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe.

[Exhibit K](#) is written testimony authored by Kim A. Lowery, Sexual Assault Advocate, Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe Victim Services Program, dated February 25, 2019, regarding support of Assembly Bill 134, presented by Kellie Harry, Victim Services Legal Advocate, Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe.

[Exhibit L](#) is written testimony authored by Amey Evaluna, Program Manager, Office of Community Engagement and Diversity Initiatives, Nevada State College, dated February 25, 2019, regarding support of Assembly Bill 134, presented by Anthony Ruiz, Senior Advisor for Government Relations and Community Affairs, Office of the President, Nevada State College.

[Exhibit M](#) is written testimony submitted by Hafid Acosta Gomez, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada, dated February 26, 2019, regarding support of Assembly Bill 134.

[Exhibit N](#) is written testimony submitted by Eden Alem, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada, dated February 26, 2019, regarding support of Assembly Bill 134.

[Exhibit O](#) is written testimony submitted by Bibiana Lopez, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada, dated February 26, 2019, regarding support of Assembly Bill 134.