

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY**

**Eighty-first Session
March 30, 2021**

The Senate Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chair Melanie Scheible at 1:01 p.m. on Tuesday, March 30, 2021, Online. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Melanie Scheible, Chair
Senator Nicole J. Cannizzaro, Vice Chair
Senator James Ohrenschall
Senator Dallas Harris
Senator James A. Settelmeyer
Senator Ira Hansen
Senator Keith F. Pickard

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Patrick Guinan, Policy Analyst
Nicolas Anthony, Counsel
Gina LaCascia, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Stephannie Tucker, Licensed Clinical Mental Health Counselor
Caitlin Gwin, Sex Worker Alliance of Nevada
Ross Armstrong, Administrator, Division of Child and Family Services,
Department of Health and Human Services
DaShun Jackson, Director, Children's Advocacy Alliance
Kerrie Kramer, The Cupcake Girls
Melissa Holland, Co-Founder and Executive Director, Awaken
Jazz Sheffer, Sex Worker Alliance of Nevada
Amy Merrell, Executive Director, The Cupcake Girls
Jim Hoffman, Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice
Melissa Broudo
Serena Evans, Policy Specialist, Nevada Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual
Violence
John Piro, Clark County Public Defender's Office

Senate Committee on Judiciary
March 30, 2021
Page 2

Kendra Bertschy, Washoe County Public Defender's Office
Casey Steward
Holly Welborn, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada
Jason Guinasso, Awaken
Alexa Foster
Emily Driscoll
William Matchko, Lieutenant, Southern Nevada Human Trafficking Task Force,
Child Exploitation Task Force, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Jennifer Noble, Nevada District Attorneys Association
Carlene Helbert, Deputy City Attorney, City of Las Vegas

VICE CHAIR CANNIZZARO:

The hearing on Senate Bill (S.B.) 164 is now open. This bill is brought by Chair Scheible who will now present the bill.

SENATE BILL 164: Revises provisions relating to victims of human trafficking.
(BDR 15-57)

SENATOR MELANIE SCHEIBLE (Senatorial District No. 9):

I am proud to present S.B. 164 to the Committee and have three copresenters with me. Stephannie Tucker is a licensed clinical mental health counselor treating survivors of human trafficking and is a member of the Sex Worker Alliance of Nevada (SWAN). Caitlin Gwin is a SWAN member as well. We are also joined by Ross Armstrong from the Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS) within the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS).

Senate Bill 164 puts a dent in Nevada's human trafficking crisis by centering victims and focusing on services rather than arrests. To inform our conversation, I want to clearly articulate my perspective on both sex work and human trafficking—understanding that it is impossible for all of us in this State, probably even for all of us in this room, to agree.

When I am not in Carson City, I pour my heart and soul into a job in law enforcement. I prosecute criminal cases ranging from traffic tickets to murders, and I work with hundreds of victims and their families. Speaking for myself, not for the office that employs me in my work as a prosecutor, it is daunting, frustrating and heartbreaking to encounter larger-than-life systematic abuses of people like those found in the human trafficking trade.

Sometimes I encounter victims of human trafficking when they are being charged with misdemeanor crimes like soliciting prostitution or trespassing. Sometimes I encounter them when they are the witnesses in a case against the person who trafficked them. Most often, I encounter these victims when they are charged with minor drug offenses or theft-related offenses and their records are already several pages long with trespassing citations. They are in front of me as a prosecutor with court-appointed attorneys before the justice court or a district court still trying to address drug problems, unemployment, housing and security, even though they have already been to jail dozens of times on misdemeanor offenses.

If I truly believed that rescue meant arrest, I would not be before you today. I do not believe that we are rescuing anybody by arresting them. It has simply not been my experience. Stephannie Tucker will restate this point in her testimony and add data specific to Nevada. Her personal stories as a licensed state clinical mental health counselor will also be part of her testimony today.

While this has been my experience, I am not afraid for reasonable minds to disagree. This is why I have brought this bill forward in its original form—to provide complete immunity to any victim of human trafficking for committing a crime under the duress of being trafficked. I understand that as written, the bill will provide an escape hatch for every person arrested on charges of soliciting prostitution—to claim that they are victims of human trafficking and be relieved of responsibility for crimes they have committed. I do not support allowing criminals to escape prosecution. The fundamental disagreement that you will encounter during this hearing is whether there is a negative impact to not arresting people who are not victims of human trafficking but are engaged in sex work.

I have been committed to a broad coalition of stakeholders to find a policy that would protect victims of human trafficking from arrest and prosecution while maintaining the tools necessary to prosecute pimps, traffickers and panderers.

A philosophical disagreement underpins this hearing which you will hear from my partners in law enforcement. They will oppose this bill because it hampers their ability to do their jobs in the way they have always done them. Law enforcement agencies broadly speaking, wish to maintain the ability to arrest people who are committing crimes such as prostitution and trespassing as a means of connecting them with services and ultimately breaking the cycle of

abuse. I have the utmost respect for these partners in law enforcement, and that is why I am committed to continuing to work with them to find an amendment to this bill that allows them to continue to work in this space and be effective.

We may never agree on fundamental philosophical differences in opinion, but that does not mean we cannot all be partners and be part of the solution. This is why I have proposed the conceptual amendment ([Exhibit B](#)) that has been provided to the members of this Committee and to the public.

When my partners in law enforcement expressed to me their concern that this bill will take away one of the tools in their tool belt without providing a meaningful alternative, I listened. I want to be clear that it has always been my hope and intention that the policy proposed in S.B. 164 would instigate the cultivation of resources that is now outlined in the amendment. In an ideal world, I would have brought forward a \$20 million proposal to form the Nation's largest antihuman trafficking task force that provides housing, medical care, job training and social services to every trafficked person in this State. Since we are still struggling to make a modest increase in the marriage license fees, which are the only source of State funding for organizations combating domestic and sexual violence, I could not propose such an expensive solution.

I believe this amendment finds the middle ground that will give survivors hope that they will be able to come forward without fear of arrest, without hampering law enforcement agencies that will be forced to change their investigative models without sufficient guidance and structure.

I would like to go through the bill and the amendment to understand exactly what they do. Broadly speaking, the amendment puts the proposal that is contained in the bill to go into effect on January 1, 2023. It establishes a new position within the DHHS responsible for creating a Statewide plan to address human trafficking. The amendment is modeled after S.B. No. 293 of the 80th Session, which you will hear from Mr. Armstrong has worked very well.

Senate Bill No. 293 of the 80th Session established a position for a coordinator of services for commercially sexually exploited children to gather all necessary information in collaboration with certain interested agencies and persons in order to come up with a plan as to how to provide services for sexually

exploited children. I am requesting that we implement a similar process for addressing human trafficking of adults.

Section 1 of the amendment, found in Part 1, establishes the coordinator of services for victims of human trafficking.

Section 2 specifies that the coordinator may be an employee of DHHS, a contractor or employed by a partner organization. This is one of the sections I am still working on with my partners and other stakeholders to come up with the right structure for this position.

Section 3 outlines the duties of the coordinator of services, which includes developing a Statewide panel of stakeholders.

Section 4 provides in more detail the requirements of the plan. An important part of the plan is developing a tool to identify victims of human trafficking and providing adequate education and utilization of the tool. The goal is to curtail the conversations in committees like our Committee about how we determine who is a victim and who is not a victim and instead hand it over to the experts in the field to tell us.

Section 5 requires the plan be submitted to the Advisory Commission on the Administration of Justice (ACAJ). I remain committed to working with the stakeholders to determine who, if anyone, should be tasked with approving the plan.

Part II makes changes to the language of the original bill specifically with regard to the immunity afforded to victims of trafficking. By changing section 1, subsections 1 and 3, the bill will specify the immunity from arrest, and immediate release from custody does not apply to felony crimes of violence as outlined in the habitual criminal statute, *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 207.012.

Adding the changes listed as 3 and 4 on page 2 of [Exhibit B](#) will allow for people who are charged with crimes of violence to assert they acted under duress as trafficking victims as an affirmative defense and as a mitigating factor at the time of sentencing.

The change listed as No. 5 in the second part of the amendment would tie the two pieces together and say that we are putting the plan into effect as the alternative to arrest and we are working on the codification of that plan with stakeholders and experts to properly assess, treat and identify victims of human trafficking.

I hope I will earn your support of S.B. 164 as it has been a long process to get to where we are today. As I mentioned earlier in my presentation, there is a wide range of people who are interested in this problem, all of whom come with their own perspectives, their own expertise and their own passion for addressing victims of human trafficking and for solving this problem.

As outlined, I have a certain perspective on what I believe to be an effective solution. I am not the authority on this matter, and as Legislators it is not only our privilege but our job and duty to come up with solutions. In this case, we have found a good model in S.B. No. 293 of the 80th Session that I am trying to recreate with S.B. 164 this Session. The bill sets forth a path for a group of qualified individuals to work together to develop a plan that will, by 2023, allow us to stop arresting victims of human trafficking and instead provide them with supportive services. To better understand the background of this bill and to understand why I believe this is the best path forward, I would like the Committee to hear from Stephannie Tucker, Caitlin Gwin and Ross Armstrong.

STEPHANIE TUCKER (Licensed Clinical Mental Health Counselor):

For a while now, I have been referred victims of trafficking and assigned court-mitigated clients—some of whom came to me because of arrests for trafficking.

I want to share a few things with the Committee. One is something that has been brought up before, which is the psychological damage of arrests during raids. There is a study by Ditmore 2009, entitled, *The Use of Raids to Fight Trafficking in Persons* <<https://doi.org/10.14197/atr.201218>>. It is a study that shows people who are arrested, specifically during raids, have psychological trauma from the experience, and it is long-standing. They have problems with mental health and trauma-related stressors, and the study goes on to say that all of this is completely and totally preventable by treating these people like victims in this circumstance instead of arresting them. There is also the problem of deportation, criminal records and the difficulty with employment afterwards.

While sitting with these people in my office, my experience has largely been they feel they did something that was not their fault, something they did not have control over, and the end result was their lives were complete collateral damage. Some have lost their children, and some had difficulty finding housing after having arrest records, especially for solicitation and prostitution. It is also challenging to find employment. It is even harder for people who already were impoverished to do expungements and find the time or have the ability to do such a thing.

I want to talk more about the impacts of being arrested and what it does to a person who is already victimized. Most importantly, what I would like for everyone to take from this is that it leaves these people with few options to do anything else. Representatives of the police and the police have good intentions—they want to take people away from traffickers. Unfortunately, I do not believe we are creating such scenarios. Part of the reason why the victims go back to their traffickers after being arrested is because once they have a criminal or arrest record, they cannot find employment in a traditional sense. If doing street-based sex work was the only source of employment, they will return to that type of work after being arrested.

Some victims know they are being trafficked, but many victims do not know it just yet—similar to domestic violence. The system prevents them from being able to approach a police officer and let the officer know what is occurring. It creates a high level of distrust when people are arrested. More to the point, many people believe that if they were to go to the police and tell them what was happening, they might be in trouble or end up charged with a crime themselves.

There are two cases in the United States where a pair of trafficked minors in different situations, Cyntoia Brown and Chrystul Kizer, who were being trafficked, took their trafficking situation into their own hands. I believe they did this because they did not have many outlets or the ability to do anything else. Both young women ended up going to prison for an extended period of time even though they were most certainly trafficking victims.

There is another report by the Coalition to Abolish Slavery and Trafficking entitled *Arrest is Not the Answer* ([Exhibit C](#)). This is an extensive research piece and similar to Ditmore 2009. It may not be apparent to some, but when people get arrested for these types of crimes, they often get arrested multiple

times—and some even up to 30 or 40 times solely for trafficking-related offenses. Some are arrested multiple times within a few days. These statistics underscore the key signal that emerges from our study—trafficking victims are arrested frequently for crimes they are forced to commit. The intended benefit of taking them off the streets by arresting them is illusory. This nationwide study shows arresting these victims does not keep them from reoffending—it actually might help them reoffend. If victims have no other option, no job or are in an abusive situation, they will reoffend.

In Nevada, out of 12,812 arrests for solicitation engaging in prostitution resulting in 9,438 convictions, there were only 162 arrests and 131 convictions for sex trafficking an adult recorded between 2013 and 2019. This is a rate of just over 1 percent of prostitution arrests resulting in a trafficking conviction. One of the things that have been presented is we must arrest these victims so we can get to the traffickers. As you can see from the numbers, this plainly cannot be happening in our State. Obviously, there are thousands of arrests, but we do not get many trafficking arrests, probably just one a month, and even fewer convictions. The people who are victims in these situations are used as pawns, and they are the people who ultimately suffer the worst consequences.

I have suggestions for how the police can identify victims of trafficking at the point of arrest as many victims have common signs. There are probably many police officers who can comment on these signs because they are the ones who see what is happening on the streets firsthand. We can offer services to victims without arresting them—one way is with nongovernmental organizations such as The Cupcake Girls. This organization is in support of this bill and has submitted evidence relating to the signs of someone being trafficked ([Exhibit D](#)).

With regard to anyone pretending to be a trafficking victim when arrested, the police know that the real victims are more than likely impoverished. People working on the street are not doing something that is safe. The police also know that almost everyone working the streets have a pimp, which means they are being trafficked. Everyone can be better served by getting these people resources instead of arresting them.

CAITLIN GWIN (Sex Worker Alliance of Nevada):

I need to stress that human trafficking is a complex and multilayered issue and should be looked at from all angles to create conversations with solutions if we want to make effective legislation moving forward. I am excited about the

opportunities S.B. 164 provides. By moving away from a system in which we are arresting victims and moving toward a system that can provide them with resources, we will instead be making a lasting change for these survivors and putting a dent in human trafficking.

We are better served if we can view human trafficking victims the way we look at the victims of domestic violence. More than just physically removing people from their abusers, we need to look at the mental manipulation that can often occur in these circumstances. Taking victims from their abusers or traffickers and putting them through another traumatic event such as an arrest will not change getting them away from the situation. We have seen many cases when victims are arrested, their abusers or traffickers tell them they will take care of them, protect them and that they are the only ones who cares about them. They also tell them the cops do not care because the cops just arrested them, and now they have fines. This is the narrative that many victims hear over and over and internalize this type of treatment and come to believe it. This is why victims find it difficult to leave the situation. Arresting these victims and making them go through another traumatic experience is not doing anything to make a permanent change. Victims are usually bailed out by their abusers and traffickers placing them right back in a bad system.

Another problem or reason why victims cannot leave sex work is the criminal record that was created while being trafficked that follows them wherever they go. A criminal record ensures that these victims stay in their situation. All their fines are being paid by their pimps or abusers, which guarantees they stay right where they are because someone is paying their fines or bail. Having a criminal record makes it difficult for victims to find traditional employment, which makes them stay in a bad situation. It is difficult to have a criminal record sealed or expunged since it takes money, resources and time.

As Ms. Tucker mentioned, we need to look for more permanent solutions. Arresting victims over and over is not the answer. This bill has similar legislation as other states, such as Wyoming, as you will see from the statement ([Exhibit E](#)) submitted by the National Lawyers Guild, Las Vegas Chapter. Nebraska also has similar statutes contained in the article ([Exhibit F](#)) submitted by Senator Scheible. We have also seen affirmative defense changes similar to this amendment in many other states such as New Hampshire and South Carolina, and the list goes on. Nevada is disparately behind the curve in creatively dealing with a solution to human trafficking.

If we continue to attack this serious problem by arresting survivors, we only continue to make an already bad situation worse. Human trafficking will not go away by itself—it will only get worse. It is time for us to update the legislation and make a commitment to the survivors in Nevada and stop this vicious cycle. Stop the punishment of these survivors—they are already being victimized by their traffickers.

ROSS ARMSTRONG (Administrator, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services):

The Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS) is at the table when it comes to victim services because we are the largest funder of victim services in this State. Last Session, we brought the Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) and Compensation Program, a compensation and assistance program all under one roof. We want to grow in the role of being the victims' services agency for the State.

Senate Bill 293 of the 80th Session focused on children and moving Nevada's response from a juvenile justice response to a human services and central services response. Such an abrupt change can be difficult. We do not want to have gaps in safety for victims and survivors.

This bill allowed DCFS to engage in an 18-month process of bringing experts to the table and having conversations about how to shift the response from law enforcement to human services. This included an appropriation for a contractor who reported to DCFS in terms of a performance contract to deliver the study as it was directed in statute. A great product was developed and presented to the Legislative Committee on Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice, which became a bill.

Senator Ratti has had a challenge executing the plan as Nevada has limited resources involving behavioral health services. We were able to identify what key services are needed along with any changes in statute that would help facilitate those changes. It has been a positive experience in taking the time necessary to bring the right stakeholders to the table at the local level as well as with the Office of the Attorney General (AG). It was essential to come together and take a look at the statutory way we have set up responding to human trafficking, which was directed to children. However, S.B. 164 includes the entire population. This is why it is important how we start to make a cohesive

movement as a State, not only in the statutory levels but in priorities for future enhancements or expansions in the services.

We found that S.B. No. 293 of the 80th Session worked better than an abrupt shift from a justice response to a health response. Overall, Nevada's system of victim services is still in a development stage because until now, it was an attachment to criminal justice. We are headed in a positive direction as we have realized that victim services should be viewed as a health issue. Therefore, a holistic group of services understanding that health includes housing and safety as well as behavioral health is the foundation of what we are trying to accomplish.

I believe the sponsor of S.B. 164 envisions its study will work similar to S.B. No. 293 of the 80th Session, and I am happy to answer any questions regarding how the process with Deputy Administrator Mandi Davis was accomplished and how it works with the money mechanism involved.

SENATOR HANSEN:

I support this bill 100 percent. Has there been any significant decline in the amount of this type of sex trafficking since last Session? There appears to be an unlimited demand, but in spite of all our efforts nothing has really changed. What is your perspective on this?

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:

Ms. Tucker could speak better to the numbers to date, but we cannot definitively say that the rate of human trafficking is decreasing in Nevada. Part of this is because we are becoming better at identifying human trafficking. We never want to confuse better identification with the problem getting worse. Sometimes, having more prosecutions and knowing about more cases does not mean there are more cases, it means we are doing a better job at finding them and prosecuting them. The changes we have made over the last several sessions have been important for numerous reasons, and one of those reasons is to find new ways to prosecute human traffickers.

Speaking for myself, this is why I work with the District Attorney's (DA) Office—to go after the bad guys who are trafficking people. It is important that my office here at the Senate and my office with the DA, together with other law enforcement agencies in Nevada, have the tools to prosecute human traffickers.

Since there have been similar bills over the last few years, we now have a platform where we can have conversations about human trafficking and what it looks like throughout Nevada. This has also given us the opportunity to implement particular policies and discover whether these policies are working. This is an example of one of those cases where we have a policy of arresting people to provide victim services and it is not working. Senate Bill 164 tries to change that.

SENATOR HANSEN:

I agree the victims should not be the ones suffering. We should be going after the "johns," not just the pimps, but the people who actually hire the girls.

The real problem in Nevada is the lack of will on the part of big businesses because they offer a package deal when they say, "What happens in Vegas, stays in Vegas." These words have powerful implications for people who have perverted appetites. We should be posting photos of these johns and pimps online when they are arrested. This would do more to discourage this unfortunate practice than anything else.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:

You are referring to the income disparity or the disparity between different populations who are more adversely affected. People who are impoverished and are engaging in sex work as a means of survival are much more likely to be picked up and arrested than the type of things you see in movies, which do exist—with highly paid call girls who work for an agency and have the anonymity of working through the internet and who are less likely to get arrested. There are issues with criminalizing the purchasing of sex because that still drives the industry underground. People trafficking other people in this way and who are arrested, this is bad for business.

I am sure there are situations when law enforcement is not going after the people who perform sex for money, just the people who pay for it. The person providing the service, however, could still face retaliation from the person who is trafficking them. There are many complexities involved in human trafficking. This is why I proposed the amendment—to allow us a year to discuss everything needed and look at other jurisdictions to come up with the best way to move forward.

MS. TUCKER:

There is an organization called SafeHarbour.org, and S.B. 164 is a Safe Harbour bill. These bills are particularly levied at minors. Last Session and during the Special Session, there were bills being brought that were Safe Harbour bills for minor trafficking victims.

It is important to know that just a few years ago, Nevada had an "F" rating within the Safe Harbour organization. The rating was based on how well Nevada protected minor trafficking victims, and it received a failing grade. In 2020, Nevada received an "A" rating. While this is not an exact answer to your question, Senator Hansen, it does show how Nevada is working toward antitrafficking throughout Nevada.

To assist the Committee in understanding the human trafficking epidemic, I have submitted evidence regarding combating human trafficking and evidence regarding antihuman trafficking ([Exhibit G](#) and [Exhibit H](#)).

SENATOR PICKARD:

I too support the idea of focusing our attention on the right people. Can you explain your amendment to S.B. 164—are you moving toward it being a study that will go into effect in 2023?

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:

At this point, the amendment is conceptual. I want everyone to know I am open to suggestions and feedback. The idea is to take the provisions contained in the bill as written, improve them, then project them out to the year 2023. This is to give us time not only to do a study but to create a plan and implement the plan. In essence, by 2023, law enforcement would no longer be able to arrest women who are being trafficked to provide these services. We already built the infrastructure to make sure someone else responds to the scene.

The amendment gives us a timeline to have solutions for all the questions that arise when arresting the victims is no longer an option. It also encompasses the DCFS and the DHHS support. Without Mr. Armstrong's understanding of human trafficking and his support, we would not have a State agency ready and willing to work through all these questions.

SENATOR PICKARD:

The conceptual amendment will eventually become a plan for the 2023 Session and then be implemented? Or take the ideas and create the statutes?

Is the idea here that these victims may be so controlled they would participate in illegal actions such as murder, kidnapping, aiding and abetting, sexual assault and robbery because they were being coerced by their pimps or traffickers? Or is there something broader to the affirmative defense?

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:

That is correct. Part of the reason for the conceptual amendment is to provide the availability of affirmative defense because victims would have to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that they committed crimes because they were victims of human trafficking and under duress. The idea is if a victim only committed a crime because he or she was being trafficked, forced and threatened by the pimp, a jury must be able to hear this. In some cases it might rise to the level of an acquittal—similar to a self-defense plea for murder. There are many ways we could structure this section.

Ms. GWIN:

The amendment also takes into account the possibility of a victim who might be committing these crimes against their trafficker. When we look at the cases of Cyntoia Brown and Chrystul Kizer, these are women who fought against their traffickers and ended up killing them to escape. But, these women were still given lengthy prison sentences for the murders.

SENATOR PICKARD:

I would not mind if we were more specific about relieving the victims of a criminal liability if they were to do harm to their traffickers.

Section 1, subsection 3 indicates we are allowing law enforcement or prosecutors, in addition to the court, to make a substantive determination as to the capability of the individual or whether or not he or she is a victim. How does this work in practice? Is it typical for law enforcement to make the initial call of whether someone is a trafficker? How will this work in practice?

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:

There are probably better ways to identify victims of human trafficking and the traffickers. This is something I look forward to working on in more detail

through the plan. In my personal and professional experience as a prosecutor, if I am prosecuting someone and I discover there were previous convictions against someone else for trafficking him or her, this would indicate the person being prosecuted was a victim of human trafficking. I would be able to review the timelines and see that this person falls under the auspices of this law, and I should dismiss the charges against them. A judge and a police officer could do the same thing. This allows for some flexibility and there will be disagreements from time to time.

The amendment may not completely resolve all types of situations or problems; but we can start with the obvious cases, making sure we are not arresting or prosecuting the wrong people. Moving forward, we will be able to better define those types of cases.

SENATOR PICKARD:

The idea of a structural mechanism to develop a plan that addresses all these scenarios is a good idea. Like Senator Hansen, I have seen similar bills in many sessions. It has become discouraging because it appears our prior efforts have not made a dent.

SENATOR HARRIS:

In other states with this type of implementation has there been a decrease in prosecution of sex traffickers? Has it become substantially more difficult? Has there been an increase of participation in helping the victims of human trafficking?

MS. TUCKER:

You can refer to [Exhibit H](#) for reference where we do have some evidence from city jurisdictions like San Francisco. These types of cases are being declined and not prosecuted. However, this is not something I have seen other states take any initiative on or publish initiatives. In San Francisco, one of the initiatives is directing victims to counseling, social work, advocacy and other services. This is probably the clearest example where it is spelled out as part of the policy for the metropolitan police department in San Francisco.

Senate Bill 164 would help make Nevada the leader in combating human trafficking, especially when it comes to treating these people as victims of crime and stop arresting them.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:

Prosecuting human trafficking cases has not become more difficult. We have seen an increase of human trafficking prosecutions in Nebraska, which has fairly progressive immunity laws. This is attributable to effectively knowing how to identify the perpetrators.

Nebraska had a total of 192 human trafficking investigations—a number much less than what we see in Nevada. This underscores the importance of taking an individualized approach to human trafficking. You can refer to [Exhibit F](#) for more details.

MS. TUCKER:

In the Ditmore 2009 study, the information compiled regarding raids and arrests were done by face-to-face interviews—a quantitative effort. These interviews included people who were victims of sex trafficking identified by law enforcement. Many of the victims were far less likely to cooperate and collaborate with police officers when they were arrested. This was especially true after raids. Human trafficking busts or sting operations caused the victims to be less likely to cooperate with law enforcement.

When this study first initiated, many victims declined to be interviewed. After discussing an agreement, possibility enabling the victims to make a deal with law enforcement, they then agreed to be interviewed.

One of the problems the AG brought up in a different meeting was it is extraordinarily hard to get people who have been arrested to later testify against their traffickers, even when the AG is fairly certain they have a good case.

While counseling people in my office, they have shared that they do not trust police officers. They also tend to have a highly negative bias toward police officers after arrest. This is something included within the Ditmore 2009 study—information about personal experiences of the survivors.

VICE CHAIR CANNIZZARO:

In previous sessions, we were asking for law enforcement to be a determiner of whether someone is a victim of being trafficked and what sort of issues that may present. How would we deal with this part, in placing some of the burden on either a court, a police officer or a prosecuting attorney?

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:

The plan within the conceptual amendment includes developing a tool to be able to determine who is and who is not a human trafficking victim. That proposal was brought to me by Melissa Holland at Awaken, where she suggests we should rely on the experts in the field who can identify a victim of human trafficking—experts who work with victims on a daily basis. We would need our law enforcement partners to utilize this tool to be able to make an effective determination.

This bill does not provide any kind of sanction for making the wrong determination as this is a collaborative process. We want people to make the right call and do the right thing because we all share the goal of ending human trafficking. If there were a particular agency having a high rate of wrong assessments, the AG would be able to investigate to determine if a pattern exists or if it is practice abuse or a pattern of practice issue.

This bill also provides numerous off-ramps for people who were identified as victims. If they are not identified at the beginning but somewhere in the middle of an investigation, they could still enjoy the protections of the law.

VICE CHAIR CANNIZZARO:

You mention off-ramps. Part of this bill says, "You shall not arrest or issue a citation to a person," but this language does not seem to be changed in the conceptual amendment. If you are looking at a tool that might be utilized by individuals who are providing services, this is a hard determination to be making when an arrest occurs or when a citation is issued.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:

I am open to changes, and that part of the bill would not go into effect until 2023. I would like to have a mechanism in place by 2023 so officers could have the tool necessary for these types of situations. Then we can determine if we are going in the right direction.

VICE CHAIR CANNIZZARO:

Even if we have a tool, there is still the potential of liability with arrest or no arrest. Some of the language needs to be changed to ensure this can work in such a capacity. Some of these determinations may be detrimental to the victim or can potentially place all concerned in worse circumstances.

In section 4 of the conceptual amendment, I need some clarification about affirmative defenses where it talks about mitigation evidence. There was also mention made of instances where individuals were charged and convicted of murder and given a long prison sentence even though they were the victims of human trafficking. Then, section 3 talks about similar events. I just want to clarify that you are talking about two different things—section 3 is about affirmative defenses, which would obviate criminal liability as to all affirmative defenses. Section 4 seems to be about mitigation evidence, which could impact the sentence once someone is convicted, which is different than an affirmative defense.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:

Yes, that is correct. They are different, and this is why they are broken up into two sections. Establishing the parameters of the affirmative defense is important—it requires more than one line. The amendment does need more work before moving forward.

VICE CHAIR CANNIZZARO:

This is moving in the right direction as NRS 194.010 and other caselaw provides for the affirmative defense of duress under certain circumstances. I know this amendment is not complete, so I am happy to continue that conversation. I do have concerns over the wording and how that may change into a completely different affirmative defense of duress under certain circumstances.

On the mitigation evidence, even if you have evidence of duress after a conviction, this is something that would be permitted under current law.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:

I agree. The mitigation portion would be allowed as a general mitigating factor. I am not so sure it needs to be outlined in the statute that being a victim of human trafficking is a mitigating factor pursuant to NRS 193.161, which has penalties for felonies committed on properties of schools. There is certainly more work to be done on the bill.

In concept, this could still be used at the time of sentencing even if the affirmative defense was brought in a trial or earlier in the proceeding and was unsuccessful.

MS. TUCKER:

I am not sure what the line of thinking is here, but I do know in the cases of Cyntoia Brown and Chrystul Kizer, these were not allowed to be used as affirmative defenses. There have been cases in the United States where either it was not allowed to be brought up or it was not allowed to be taken into account for whatever reason.

VICE CHAIR CANNIZZARO:

These are all valid concerns. I want to make sure when we are talking about the conceptual amendment and additional changes, I did have and want to continue the conversation with Chair Scheible over how this interplay will work with affirmative defenses of duress. With the mitigation evidence, which is also provided for in Nevada law, this may be the difference—Nevada law versus other state laws.

Thank you, Chair Scheible, for your presentation. We can now move to testimony in support of S.B. 164.

DASHUN JACKSON (Director, Children's Advocacy Alliance):

We stand in support of S.B. 164. This bill is essential to the protection of sex-trafficked victims. We understand that those who experience human trafficking have no choice but to end up in these situations. The victims should not be criminalized. They should receive the help needed to make a permanent change.

KERRIE KRAMER (The Cupcake Girls):

As an organization that believes in and provides protection resources for sex workers and survivors of human trafficking, we believe S.B. 164 and its proposed amendment are good steps in the right direction—helping survivors become whole again. We appreciate the sponsor for bringing this legislation forward and including us in the stakeholder meetings. We look forward to continuing to work with law enforcement and other stakeholders through the process to create a substantial plan which will provide much needed support and resources for survivors.

MELISSA HOLLAND (Co-Founder and Executive Director of Awaken):

We are a northern Nevada based nonprofit that works with victims and survivors of sex trafficking. I am here in full support of the amended version of S.B. 164. There has been incredibly valuable information voiced today regarding

the complexity of sex trafficking: service provisions, care for survivors, the trauma and so much more.

A few years ago, I appeared in court to support a woman who was a victim of sex trafficking. For the sake of the story, I will call this woman Amanda.

In saying you are going to court to support someone, you can imagine a scene that would involve Amanda in a position where justice will be served for the crimes committed against her. Unfortunately, this court scene involves Amanda in handcuffs, awaiting her time before the judge to hear the charges. The image of Amanda in handcuffs had a profound impact on me because in the human trafficking movement, the image everyone sees is two hands in handcuffs and that is the picture used to show the public what human trafficking looks like.

Sadly, this is the image and reality that our justice system is treating victims of human trafficking. The ones who are called to serve and protect are mirroring the images we use to describe traffickers. We absolutely must reevaluate what we believe justice to truly be. This bill does that. Senate Bill 164 gives us the opportunity to reevaluate the image of how we serve and protect. We should not model it after the images we use to describe and bring light to human trafficking.

The organization I work with also works with law enforcement. Some of the questions today asked about whether the method described in S.B. 164 is effective can be answered by how Washoe County changed the way its law enforcement interacts with victims. A few years ago, the County's officers began to move in the direction of not arresting the victims. As a result, we are seeing increased participation and success in the arrests of traffickers and prosecution. In 2019, there were 11 trafficking-related arrests; in 2020, there were 28 arrests. Thirty arrests were solicitation of a minor. There were 31 individuals who received advocacy services instead of being arrested.

JAZZ SHEFFER (Sex Worker Alliance of Nevada):

We have submitted our written support statement of S.B. 164 ([Exhibit I](#)). However, I will be reading testimony from another member of Sex Worker Alliance of Nevada who wishes to remain anonymous:

Both my parents have been in and out of prison since I was little. I grew up mostly in foster care. After I turned 18, I did

not feel I had anyone since I had to leave foster care. But I felt like a lucky person because I found a boyfriend who I thought loved me. It was his idea in the first place saying, "It was a good way to make money for us." He knew people who did this type of stuff. I felt he was the only person in the world who really loved me and understood me. But it is true that he took all my money and made me work as a prostitute to support us. Later, I could see that he was abusive, and I know he coerced me to do this even though I did not want to.

After I went to therapy for a long time and being away from the situation, I know mentally that this is not really so much my fault; but it feels like people will judge me or blame me for what happened. They would think I am bad, even though I know now that this was sex trafficking. I did not think that someone in my situation should have to go to jail or have a criminal record. I was pretty young and I did not know everything I know now. I did not see the abuse or that I was being used and manipulated. I know I am lucky that I did not go to jail like so many people do; but it is hard for me to think that people see me as a criminal because I know it was the hardest time I ever had in my life. It is even hard to talk about now so many years later. I never want anyone to know this happened to me. I think a lot of people in this situation have a lot of shame too. It is like talking about rape and people think it is your fault. I spent a lot of time thinking this way and that it was my fault.

I want this bill to pass because maybe I could have felt like I could do something better than what I did if I thought I could go to the police, or if I knew back then that I would not be a criminal. Maybe I would have got the help sooner.

AMY MERRELL (Executive Director, The Cupcake Girls):

We are a nonprofit organization that works in the prevention and aftercare of sex trafficking within Nevada. On behalf of the 759 clients that we served in 2020, 60 percent disclosed they were being sex trafficked. Senate Bill 164 will make positive strides toward the eradication of sex trafficking—which is one of the goals we fight for everyday as an organization.

The Cupcake Girls spend an enormous amount of time working to reunite our clients with their children. When they are arrested, their children are placed into foster care. It has been proven for decades that children are far better off staying with their parents over foster care, except for certain circumstances.

We also spend a lot of time working on record expungement so our clients are able to stay out of and away from the prison industrial complex. We have many clients who are desperately trying to pay their fines incurred by arrests. Research has proven that arrests do not help stop sex trafficking—it magnifies the problem. Arresting survivors causes the people who are being trafficked to go deeper and deeper underground, causing more harm to individuals being trafficked as well as being better business for the pimps who are trafficking these victims.

Handing someone a packet of resources, arresting them, booking them and then having them deal with up to four months of missing work, paying for daycare and occurring a mountain of debt is not protecting nor serving them or our communities. I know from conversations with local police departments that officers do want to protect and serve our communities.

As Senator Pickard said, what is being done has not made a dent—it is time to try something new. We believe that all members of our communities want to end sex trafficking, and we are asking that S.B. 164 be a step toward changing the systems that are in place and help the victims and survivors of sex trafficking. Let us listen to the survivors and believe in them.

JIM HOFFMAN (Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice):

We support S.B. 164. However, we want to make sure everyone is clear, this is not a decriminalization bill. An increasing number of people support the criminalization in recognition of the fact that many people who engage in sex work are doing so voluntarily. Other people disagree with this perception. This broader conversation is ongoing, and we believe it is an important one to have separately from this bill. However, there is one area where a consensus is emerging. People who are not voluntarily engaging in sex work should be assisted in moving out of the bad situation. The criminalization of trafficking victims is an obstacle in helping people escape trafficking. This bill helps to remove that obstacle, and we support it.

MELISSA BROUDO:

I support S.B. 164. I am a longtime attorney and advocate for sex workers and survivors of human trafficking. I have dedicated most of my legal career to doing criminal defense for survivors of human trafficking. I see what this bill seeks to do in Nevada, which is to ameliorate the harm of the criminal justice system for people who are being forced into prostitution and trafficking. I have personally seen in my practice many people in the sex industry who wish to come forward to report violence or abuse but fear arrest.

This bill will not remedy all of the fractured relationships between the people in the sex industry and law enforcement, but it will go a long way in sending the message that everyone matters. Everyone needs to be able to come forward to report crimes committed against them.

We need to have legislation in place before, not after, the fact. We should not prosecute people who are survivors of sex trafficking, and this bill would do that.

SERENA EVANS (Policy Specialist, Nevada Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence):

Thank you, Senator Scheible, for your work on this bill and for bringing together so many stakeholders throughout the State on this matter and allowing us to be part of these incredibly important conversations. We support S.B. 164.

Every time victim survivors are arrested and detained, they are at risk of having their children taken from them, losing their jobs and missing out on critical income in which they rely to house and care for their families. Being arrested also puts victim survivors at risk for not being able to obtain future housing or stable employment which increases their risk factors for additional victimization. Aside from the effects that arresting victim survivors have on their personal lives, we know that arresting victim survivors is not making it an easy way out of trafficking. Many victim survivors do not identify as victims and being arrested only drags them back into the arms of their perpetrators because it is the only life they know, or perpetrators are the only people they can rely on to bail them out of jail.

To truly help victim survivors of trafficking, we must increase community advocacy. We need to support and meet these individuals with the empathy and unique resources they require. Being detained in a jail cell does not connect the

victim survivors to resources and does not offer them the compassion and coordinated community response they need to be able to escape their forced lifestyle.

We are in favor of this bill as it lays the legislative groundwork to be able to treat victim survivors of trafficking with dignity instead of penalizing them and limiting their futures because of their victimization.

JOHN PIRO (Clark County Public Defender's Office):

We are in support of S.B. 164. Ms. Holland was correct when she testified that trafficking victims in handcuffs are what we normally see from our side of the criminal justice system.

For those of you who were on this Committee and heard my story last Session about whom I call Mrs. Smith, when the police and prosecutors miss a legitimate trafficking victim, the public defender generally discovers it. It is a struggle to get the attention of both prosecutors and police. I am still working to clean up Mrs. Smith's record from being trafficked, which is a long and arduous process that she should never have had to deal with in the first place. I am thankful that we are bringing a bill forward to stop criminalizing survivors. Senator Hansen is also correct—the measures in place are not having the intended effects we had hoped for.

We would ask that we be included in the conversations going forward because we are crucial catchers of people who are victims and whom the police and prosecutors have missed.

KENDRA BERTSCHY (Washoe County Public Defender's Office):

On March 27, 2014, the United Nations Human Rights Committee urged the United States to end the prosecution of human trafficking victims for crimes they are forced to commit. Here we are, on March 30, 2021, discussing legislation that would end the prosecution of human trafficking victims.

Our office supports S.B. 164 and the amendment because what we are doing is not working. Retraumatizing a victim does not build trust, it does not solve the issues, and arresting victims simply does not work. Unfortunately, victims are still being caught in the crossfire. I can think of cases where I have represented victims of human trafficking. It is quite an ordeal to try to convince the DA, law

enforcement and members of the judiciary that the person was a victim survivor and should receive services, not be sent to prison.

We strongly support this bill and agree with Mr. Piro. We would like to be part of the conversations going forward to ensure that we are all working on supporting victim survivors.

CASEY STEWARD:

I have submitted my written statement in support of S.B. 164 along with evidence regarding sex trafficking ([Exhibit J](#)). However, I would like to read a statement on behalf of someone who was unable to attend and wanted her story heard:

My name is Alea Sheets. I am 23 years old and a lifelong Nevadan. I was a victim of child trafficking. As a teenager, one of my peers approached me about a money-making opportunity. She told me she worked at a massage parlor where she made hundreds of dollars daily. I was immediately interested. I met the owner of the massage parlor, a much older man. He told me I could keep all the money I made while working for him—all I had to do was give him affection and sexual favors. I did not think of myself as a victim at the time. To me, the massage parlor job was a fair business exchange. But years later, I saw the old man on the news being arrested for human trafficking. In retrospect, I realized he abused and trafficked me as well.

I tell you this story because trafficking is not often a black and white scenario where a stranger kidnaps you from a grocery store. Trafficking happens even when kids live in supportive, loving homes. Impoverished children are more likely to become victims. Many victims are coerced and to some extent participate willingly. Had I been arrested while working at the massage parlor, I would not have identified myself as a victim, and I would have had a criminal record for something that I did while coerced by a trafficker.

I urge this Committee to pass S.B. 164. It allows victims to access resources without facing criminal penalties. In our

jurisdiction, there are children serving sentences for prostitution. Harsh penalties do not serve as a deterrent, and they do not make our communities safer. As lawmakers, it is your duty to make our communities safer. For this reason, I encourage you to focus less on criminal penalties and more on providing mental health services, food and housing services, and security. Trafficking happens because victims feel stuck in their circumstances. Punishing them for being vulnerable is not a solution. There is no penalty for an abuser who has worked implicating and endangering the victim. Please pass S.B. 164.

HOLLY WELBORN (American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada):

We are in support of S.B. 164. We are firm in our position that full decriminalization of sex work is the best policy to protect the health, safety and welfare of both victims of sex trafficking and consensual sex workers. Most of us can agree that prosecuting sex trafficking victims is a grave injustice and we must do whatever it takes to end this practice. Policy makers should be listening to what victims are saying; lawmakers need to do whatever is necessary to improve victims' health and well-being. This does not include an arrest record. Instead, the State should adopt policies that limit unwanted law enforcement presence and adopt functional legislation.

JASON GUINASSO (Awaken):

I have provided pro bono legal services to survivors of sex trafficking in various legal context for nearly ten years. This includes crisis legal services, restorative legal services and services to provide survivors with an opportunity to hold their traffickers accountable by bringing civil actions. I support the policy objective of S.B. 164 with the conceptual amendment.

Survivors of sex trafficking are not criminals. They should not be treated like criminals by law enforcement or our judicial system. Victims of sex trafficking should be provided with support services, and law enforcement should focus on arresting the buyers and traffickers. Our legal system should hold those buyers and traffickers accountable for their crimes.

I commend Senator Scheible for her good-faith effort to work with an adverse coalition of people, stakeholders and organizations who all want to end sex trafficking in Nevada. I especially appreciate the efforts she has made to make amendments that will focus on policy that is best for victim survivors. She

chose to lead, to listen and to take action in collaboration with all Nevada stakeholders who want to implement survivor-focused law and policy.

ALEXA FOSTER:

I am a survivor of sex trafficking. I was raised in a middle class family by parents who went to an Ivy League school. I was exposed to alcohol and pornography at 12 years old and was molested too. When I was 17 years old, I was intimidated into moving out of my parent's house and became a victim of sex trafficking for over a year. I had my eighteenth birthday enslaved to my pimp.

While under control of my trafficker, I was involved in three prostitution stings. In total, I have six criminal charges related to prostitution. I was coerced into giving false testimony regarding charges made against my pimp who was only arrested during one sting. His charges were ultimately dropped because of my supporting testimony.

I have been away from my trafficker for over a decade and my criminal record continues to haunt me. It prevents me from getting certain jobs, and it has been impossible to live in certain neighborhoods. It is important that S.B. 164 passes because arresting sex trafficking victim survivors does not help them get off the streets. Trafficking victims are coerced and have fear implanted in them by their pimp. They are too afraid to testify against anyone. We need to end sex trafficking.

EMILY DRISCOLL:

I live in Senate District 3 and Assembly District 10. I am in support of S.B. 164. I am a law student and single mother. I am also a sex worker.

It is important to our community to take care of the vulnerable. Trafficking is incredibly harmful to Nevada, and the current laws inadvertently protect the pimps and harm the victim survivors. Increasing criminal penalties for trafficking puts victims at risk for being implicated as traffickers because law enforcement and our courts do not always understand the nuance in trafficking.

Trafficking victims deserve the chance of not only an affirmative defense to the charges being dismissed but the chance to avoid arrest and the stigma and trauma of further victimization by their traffickers and pimps and the criminal justice system. Senate Bill 164 will provide victims with a chance to escape

abusive situations while avoiding the cost and lifelong impact of criminal proceedings against them.

WILLIAM MATCHKO (Lieutenant, Southern Nevada Human Trafficking Task Force and Child Exploitation Task Force, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department):

We are opposed to S.B. 164 in its current form but hope to be able to come to a position of support.

In response to the previous statistics on the prosecution of sex trafficking and pandering, the main reason why successful prosecutions are so low is because victims many times do not cooperate with the Department. In this situation we, as a community, need to look for a resolution, and this bill might be that path.

This prosecution cannot be forced upon law enforcement. If we are serious about updating legislation, we should make sex trafficking and pandering a State crime. Under the original language of S.B. 164, if sex traffickers become aware that officers are required to release prostitutes when they report being victims of sex trafficking, they will manipulate this law to their advantage.

Suspects who are not actual victims will create false reports just to be released from custody to work the streets again. The actual victims of sex trafficking will be released back into the hands of traffickers instead of being removed from the situation and have the potential to receive services. We feel this will increase the amount of sex trafficking victims that will flood our State and the surrounding areas.

The language of determining a reasonable victim of sex trafficking is an extremely specialized investigation. Expecting police officers to be trafficking experts places an unreasonable standard upon an already overburdened police officer. We have received a conceptual amendment to S.B. 164 and are still working through the language, which may alleviate some of our concerns.

Sex traffickers often employ a trusted coconspirator referred to as a "bottom." The duties of this hired muscle include recruiting, accounting, transportation and beating of the prostitutes under the trafficker's control. This way the trafficker does not get his hands dirty. By setting this precedence, all coconspirators will be given immunity from their crimes due to following orders.

The language in this bill includes victims of pandering with victims of sex trafficking. I want to make it clear that a victim of pandering is not being forced into sex work—where the victim of sex trafficking is being forced into sex trafficking. These two victims are not facing the same consequences and should not be viewed in the same way. Under the current language, if a prostitute is convinced by a roommate to work to pay the rent, this prostitute becomes the victim of pandering and sex trafficking. If this prostitute goes on a date and commits a crime against the john, the prostitute would have immunity from the crimes committed.

While we are opposed to S.B. 164 at this time, we are hopeful that we can move to a position of support. We are dedicated to effectively combatting sex trafficking as well as reducing the trauma experienced by sex trafficking victim survivors. We are committed to partnering and supplying the victims the resources they need to get away from sex trafficking and their traffickers. If there are any questions for the Department, I would be happy to field them now or after this hearing.

JENNIFER NOBLE (Nevada District Attorneys Association):

We are in opposition to S.B. 164. However, we want to thank Chair Scheible for her willingness to tackle this issue and to include us in these important conversations. We do look forward to continuing these conversations and in working with all stakeholders toward a bill we all can support.

While we do like the description in Part I of the conceptual amendment regarding the coordinator's purpose and task, we believe any recommended changes should be vetted through the ACAJ before becoming effective.

We are concerned about exempting persons from criminal liability regarding a wide variety of crimes without requiring a clear nexus between the crime committed and the victim's experience as a trafficked person. We also share Vice Chair Cannizzaro's concern about unintended consequences that could arise when we create a separate duress affirmative defense that is specific to trafficking victims.

To Senator Hansen's question, I would note that as prosecutors, one of our biggest obstacles in prosecuting sex traffickers is the insidious and effective dissuasion of victim survivors by traffickers that occurs prior to trial. They apply victims with drugs, intimidate them, hide them and help them leave the

jurisdiction. I hope that stakeholders who testify today in support of this bill, including our defense bar, might also consider the possibility that removing impediments to prosecution of sex traffickers who keep the victims from testifying and increasing the penalty for dissuading the trafficking victims might be an option in working to end this epidemic.

CARLENE HELBERT (Deputy City Attorney, City of Las Vegas):

My testimony today is limited to simply seeking clarification on the phrase "capacity as a victim of human trafficking" as set forth in the original bill, section 1, subsection 3, paragraph (b), and in the conceptual amendment, Part II, section 1.

Certain crimes are more commonly and directly associated with human trafficking victims than others. However, when dealing with crimes other than solicitation and prostitution, it can be a bit unclear what the capacity as victims of human trafficking means. We are seeking clarification on whether other crimes that may be entitled to dismissal are limited to those committed during the victimization period; is it any crime committed during this time, or is it limited to those committed at the direction of the implication of the trafficker or pimp?

The conceptual amendment includes having acted under duress in the course of being trafficked in the section dealing with affirmative defenses. However, the phrase, "capacity as a victim of human trafficking," is used in this section involving dismissals. We are unclear if this distinction is purposeful. We are not taking a position on the language, just seeking clarification to properly apply the law should the bill pass.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

I want to reiterate my sincere commitment to continue working with all stakeholders, including those who called in to testify, those who did not and those who I have yet to discover. I want to make sure we pass a piece of meaningful legislation that helps end or at least decreases the human trafficking crisis in Nevada. I would also welcome any members of the Committee or anybody who is listening to reach out to me personally if they have questions, feedback or want to discuss the bill further.

VICE CHAIR CANNIZZARO:

The hearing on S.B. 164 is now closed.

Senate Committee on Judiciary
March 30, 2021
Page 31

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:
We are now adjourned at 2:48 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Gina LaCascia,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Melanie Scheible, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit Letter	Begins on Page	Witness / Entity	Description
	A	1		Agenda
S.B. 164	B	1	Senator Melanie Scheible	Proposed Conceptual Amendment
S.B. 164	C	1	Stephannie Tucker	Evidence Submission
S.B. 164	D	1	The Cupcake Girls	Support Statements
S.B. 164	E	1	Sex Work Advocacy Subcommittee / National Lawyers Guild, Las Vegas Chapter	Support Statement
S.B. 164	F	1	Senator Melanie Scheible	Support Article Task Force Review
S.B. 164	G	1	Stephannie Tucker	Evidence Submission 1
S.B. 164	H	1	Stephannie Tucker	Evidence Submission 2
S.B. 164	I	1	Sex Worker Alliance of Nevada	Support Statement
S.B. 164	J	1	Casey Steward	Support Statement