

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

**Eighty-Second Session
March 3, 2023**

The Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chair Brittney Miller at 9:03 a.m. on Friday, March 3, 2023, in Room 3138 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, 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/82nd2023.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Brittney Miller, Chair
Assemblywoman Elaine Marzola, Vice Chair
Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod
Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen
Assemblywoman Venicia Considine
Assemblywoman Danielle Gallant
Assemblyman Ken Gray
Assemblywoman Alexis Hansen
Assemblywoman Melissa Hardy
Assemblywoman Selena La Rue Hatch
Assemblywoman Erica Mosca
Assemblywoman Sabra Newby
Assemblyman David Orentlicher
Assemblywoman Shondra Summers-Armstrong
Assemblyman Toby Yurek

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Angie Taylor, Assembly District No. 27

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst
Aaron Klatt, Committee Secretary
Ashley Torres, Committee Assistant

Minutes ID: 269



OTHERS PRESENT:

Brigid J. Duffy, Assistant District Attorney, Juvenile Division, Clark County District Attorney's Office; and representing Nevada District Attorneys Association

Jonathan Norman, Statewide Advocacy, Outreach, and Policy Director, Nevada Coalition of Legal Service Providers

Christopher M. Ries, Detective, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department

Serena Evans, Policy Director, Nevada Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence

Jason Walker, Sergeant, Administrative Division, Legislative Liaison, Washoe County Sheriff's Office; and representing Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association

Nicole Reilly, Ombudsman for Domestic Violence, Sexual Assault and Human Trafficking, Office of the Attorney General

Regan Comis, representing Awaken

Pamela Del Porto, Executive Director, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association

Dawn Christensen, Vice President of Communications and Corporate Responsibility, Nevada Resort Association

Jessica Kay, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada

Scott Smith, Sergeant, Reno Police Department

John T. Jones, Jr., Chief Deputy District Attorney, Legislative Liaison, Clark County District Attorney's Office; and representing Nevada District Attorneys Association

Debra Sisco, Finance Officer, Xquisite, Carson City, Nevada

Liz Ortenburger, Chief Executive Officer, SafeNest

Lauren Boitel, Chair, Nevada Policy Council on Human Trafficking

Victoria McMahan, Community Organizer, Las Vegas Red Umbrella Collective

Kelli Radnothy, representing Xquisite, Carson City, Nevada

Tessyn Opferman, representing Nevada Women's Lobby

Erica Roth, Government Affairs Liaison, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's Office

Jim Hoffman, representing Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice

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

Chair Miller:

I would like to welcome everyone here in Carson City as well as those in Las Vegas and anyone watching online to the Assembly Committee on Judiciary. We have three bills that we are hearing today. We are going to open first with Assembly Bill 183. Assembly Bill 183 is being presented by Brigid Duffy from the Clark County District Attorney's Office. This measure revises provisions relating to the protection of children from commercial sexual exploitation. When you are ready, please proceed.

Assembly Bill 183: Revises provisions relating to the protection of children from commercial sexual exploitation. (BDR 5-321)

Brigid J. Duffy, Assistant District Attorney, Juvenile Division, Clark County District Attorney's Office; and representing Nevada District Attorneys Association:

I have with me Jonathan Norman from Nevada Coalition of Legal Service Providers. He is my cochair, and when we created the language for this bill, he was a member of the Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada, and I would like him here since this was a coproduct of our work together. Assembly Bill 183 came out of the Nevada Coalition to Prevent the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children, which was formed out of executive order in 2016. Our membership of our coalition came from all over the state. It was advocates, survivors, child welfare agencies, probation departments, law enforcement, judges, and representation from Clark, Washoe, and the rural counties. As a coalition, we have had the honor of presenting recommended legislation over the past several sessions. In this most recent interim we had one issue that we identified, as a commission, as being one of our priorities: that is improving our ability for early identification of children who are at risk of being trafficked or who are being trafficked. Children who have experienced trauma are already at a higher risk to become victims of predators, and with this recognition our commission shows, as this priority, a required screening tool for risk factors of children that are entering into county and state systems.

I will walk you through A.B. 183. Section 1 is a cleanup and consolidation section. Section 2 adds to *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 62C.035, to the screening requirements we already have of mental health, alcohol, and drugs, the screening requirement to determine if a child is at risk of being a victim of commercial sexual exploitation (CSEC). It also adds the mandated reporter requirement to that section. Section 3 adds the screening requirement to children who are committed to state facilities. Those would be children who have committed delinquent acts who are then being committed into one of our three state facilities. Section 3 also adds a mandated reporting requirement if during the screening they do determine that a child is at risk or is a victim of trafficking.

Section 4 adds a screening requirement into NRS 62E.516, which is another delinquency statute. Section 5 adds a screening requirement to NRS Chapter 432B for children who are placed into the custody of a child welfare agency. The requirement in this section is also to ensure that the screening tool is based on research, it is reliable, and it is valid because this is a new requirement being added into NRS Chapter 432B. The other sections already have a requirement of validity based on research and reliability; thus, we are adding into the NRS Chapter 432B statute that requirement. Section 6 adds the new screening requirement into NRS Chapter 432C, which is our mandated reporting section.

Prior to our cancellation on Monday, you would have seen an amendment that may have been circulated. The child welfare agencies reached out and indicated that it is important to note that currently we do not have any valid risk assessment tools or screening tools for children under the age of ten. We cannot find one nationally. Therefore, they wanted to add an age requirement of ten. If you saw that amendment starting to circulate before we ended

up finalizing it, I am now going to tell you that we now have a finalized amendment which should be on Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System [[Exhibit C](#)]. Thank you to Assemblyman Orentlicher who made the recommendation to Clark County that we make the language a little broader so that if we can identify or form a screening tool for under the age of ten, we are able to capture that. This is a friendly amendment that you should have access to, and it simply changes that the requirement would be used if it is deemed to be valid for all ages. With that, I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Assemblywoman Hardy:

Several times conducting a screening is mentioned, the method that is used, and then obviously we are adding that for victims of commercial sexual exploitation. Has the screening and the method already been developed for use in these cases, or is this something that still needs to be developed?

Brigid Duffy:

It is good for you all to know that currently we are already doing this screening without being required by statute. Not everybody in the state is using the exact same tools, but we are all doing it at some level on the child welfare agency side, at least in Washoe County and Clark County. Then on the juvenile justice side in Clark County, they have begun doing it within the last couple of years. After a child comes into their custody, they use the same tool that the child welfare agency uses. So, we do have one that we have adopted over the years from other jurisdictions. The one that we have used is specifically based on the one out of Washington State. There will be a second set of bill draft requests coming through that I think are going to mold this one together where we are hoping to get together as a state and adopt the one specific tool that everybody will use consistently. This bill is just making sure we mandate that requirement.

Assemblywoman Newby:

I have a question about section 3, which amends NRS 62E.513, which is the detention of children. Under subsection 1, paragraphs (a) and (b), it discusses the screening of children for mental health services, alcohol, and other substance use disorders. Since this is new language, does that suggest that they currently are not being screened for mental health services, alcohol, or other substance use disorders in the juvenile detention facilities?

Brigid Duffy:

They do already screen children for those things. You will see above in the existing language that each child that is adjudicated is screened to determine whether they are in need. I think that may be a legal question as to why they repeated it in the second section, but we do already screen for mental health, alcohol, and substance abuse. This is now going to be a third required screening.

Assemblywoman La Rue Hatch:

Thank you for bringing this important issue to us today. My question is on the commercial sexual exploitation. Obviously, that is critical, and we should be looking at it, but why are

we focusing just on commercial? Are they also being screened for sexual abuse within the home or any other issue along those lines?

Brigid Duffy:

When a child is brought into juvenile detention in Clark County, they do utilize a screening tool. It is under that mental health screening where they can disclose whether or not they have been the victim of sexual abuse. We do often get indications of abuse, which then results in contact with other law enforcement and child welfare agencies. Then of course, when a child comes into the child welfare agency, we are assessing that child's safety and that would encompass that child's physical and emotional safety. Maybe there is domestic violence in the home or drug use in the home, but when we get that child in, there is an entire screening process.

Assemblywoman La Rue Hatch:

I am just wondering, if that is happening, why are we explicitly calling out the commercial portion in statute and not the other portion. Why does one need statute and the other one does not?

Brigid Duffy:

I think that is a good question. I am focusing on the identification of victims of sex trafficking. It was based upon our coalition who all met and said this is something that we are lacking in our statute that other jurisdictions across the country have requirements of. I really could not answer why child welfare, juvenile justice, or anybody else would not want to specifically have that in statute. I think this is an important bill because we do not necessarily get information that a child is being trafficked just because they tell us that they have been sexually or physically abused. However, with the screening tools that we have now, you are able to flesh out more of that information. Those victims of physical and sexual abuse are definitely at a higher risk to become those trafficking victims.

Assemblywoman Gallant:

The human psyche does not fit neatly in a box. I am curious in terms of the screening, is there some wiggle room to be able to identify different ways that kids will present the abuse, because it does not always look the same. That way, clinicians are not pigeonholed into this one standard practice; it allows for some creativity to really get that information out of that kid.

Brigid Duffy

It would help if I identify what we do now. Our screening tool is a dozen very high-level questions, and they are not specifically asked directly of the child. Some of them are personal questions relating to observations. It is information gathering and collateral information gathering, collateral meaning not directly from the child. For example, knowing if the child had a previous runaway episode, or if they had multiple cellphones and hotel room keys in their possession when they were brought into custody—things that are observable and not necessarily questions you would ask the child to gather that information. If you mark off so many of those boxes during this screening, then a report is made by

a mandated reporter, that being a peace officer or a professional within the juvenile justice agency or the child welfare agency. That report then would go to the child welfare hotline and then a more in-depth assessment would be done.

It took me a long time when working in this coalition to figure out the difference between a screening and an assessment. I know you are aware of this difficulty, because I know your history and prior work in this field. We would say screening when we meant assessment and vice versa or use them interchangeably, but I have learned that they are two very different things. So, we do a high-level screening to determine if an assessment is needed. We identify that a child came in with a neck tattoo, hotel room keys, multiple cell phones, et cetera, then the more in-depth assessment would come in. There are going to be a series of bills such as training bills coming where we require training for identification so that this will all come together. I hope that answers your question.

Assemblywoman Mosca:

When it comes to the mandatory reporting, the language uses the phrase, "as soon as practicable." Can you share what that is in execution currently with the ones already happening and what you hope this will be?

Brigid Duffy:

It is as soon as practicable and no longer than 24 hours. It is pretty quick.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

Thank you for being here and bringing this bill. I just need clarification on section 5 of the amendment, the green wording, "unless the agency determines that there is no screening method available which satisfies the requirements of subsection 3." My lay interpretation would be that we are giving that bit of room because maybe in rural districts they might not be able to do this readily until more things come down the line. Therefore, when you reference section 3, already in existing language, there are things that are being done. If you could just help me understand why the green language is present in section 5.

Brigid Duffy:

That is to catch the fact that we are not currently able to find a screening tool for a child under the age of ten. If there is a tool available, one becomes available, or we work with experts to develop that tool, this deals with that. We have not been, through our research, able to find one. The rural communities should not have any problem using the same tools that are being used in Washoe County and Clark County. The tools are only one page in length and we all work together.

Assemblywoman Cohen:

Thank you for your work on the coalition. I have a question about section 5. I want to make sure we have a clear understanding when we are talking about agencies. Those agencies are never going to be agencies which would provide legal representation, correct? The child is still going to have attorney-client privilege and none of the agencies that provide legal representation are going to be considered mandatory reporters.

Bridget Duffy:

Nothing in this bill changes the current mandatory reporter statute and there is a carve-out for children's attorneys with regard to having to report attorney-client privilege. Whatever their standard is, I know there is a carve-out within that to protect them and we are not changing that.

Chair Miller:

Okay, thank you. Not seeing any additional questions, I would like to open it up for testimony. We will start with anyone that would like to provide testimony in support of the bill here in Carson City.

Jonathan Norman, Statewide Advocacy, Outreach, and Policy Director, Nevada Coalition of Legal Service Providers:

At any given time, we have 30 attorneys representing over 3,000 kids in foster care. I think the work of this Committee over the past few sessions and the bills that are passed in this space provide the opportunity for Nevada to lead the way for this difficult group of kids. As you saw, I was up here with District Attorney Duffy as a copresenter, and we are in full support of this bill.

Christopher M. Ries, Detective, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:

We want to offer our support on this bill.

Serena Evans, Policy Director, Nevada Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence:

We know that timely intervention and connection to resources may be the key to helping minor victim-survivors escape commercial sexual exploitation. We are here today in support of this bill. So often victim-survivors of commercial sexual exploitation do not recognize that they are a victim-survivor, nor do they have a safe space to disclose their abuse, as many experience the abuse and exploitation at the hands of a family member. It is not uncommon for CSEC victim-survivors to be brought in for other crimes due to unhealthy coping mechanisms or a direct correlation with their abuse. Establishing screening for commercial sexual exploitation as standard procedure for intake is a trauma-informed, victim-centered approach to addressing the widespread issue. Not only will this allow victim-survivors a safe place to disclose abuse, but it will allow the juvenile justice system to make immediate connections to the proper resources and supports and take necessary precautions to intervene in the abuse and keep that child safe. We support this measure.

Jason Walker, Sergeant, Administrative Division, Legislative Liaison, Washoe County Sheriff's Office:

I am here testifying in support of [Assembly Bill 183](#).

Nicole Reilly, Ombudsman for Domestic Violence, Sexual Assault and Human Trafficking, Office of the Attorney General:

I have had the privilege of sitting on the CSEC coalition with Bridget Duffy and have been a part of all the conversations for this bill and other bills that she is talking about coming forward to make all this gel together nicely. We are in support of this bill.

Regan Comis, representing Awaken:

We just want to voice our support for A.B. 183.

Pamela Del Porto, Executive Director, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association:

We want to offer our support for A.B. 183.

**Dawn Christensen, Vice President of Communications and Corporate Responsibility,
Nevada Resort Association:**

We appreciate the work that has gone into this bill. We support A.B. 183 and see this as an important tool in protecting children.

Chair Miller:

I will go ahead and open up testimony for anyone in opposition. [There was no one.] I will go ahead and open up testimony for neutral. [There was no one.] There are no final remarks from the bill presenter, District Attorney Duffy, but we definitely thank you for flying up here this morning to present this bill. With that, we will go ahead and close the hearing on Assembly Bill 183. I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 145. Assembly Bill 145 is presented by Vice Chair Marzola. It revises provisions relating to prostitution.

Assembly Bill 145: Revises provisions relating to prostitution. (BDR 15-613)

Assemblywoman Elaine Marzola, Assembly District No. 21:

Today, I am here to introduce Assembly Bill 145. Joining me today at the witness table is Regan Comis with R&R Partners, Sergeant Scott Smith with the Northern Nevada Human Exploitation Trafficking Unit, and in Las Vegas, we have Ms. Jessica Kay, a survivor, to share her story. I have submitted an amendment [[Exhibit D](#)] to the bill that is on Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS) that we will be working from today.

Last session, we revised Nevada law by separating into two different sections of the *Nevada Revised Statutes* provisions applicable only to prostitutes and customers of the prostitutes. The proposed amendment to A.B. 145 revises provisions concerning customers, also sometimes referred to as "johns," who unlawfully engage in prostitution or solicitation of prostitution. The purpose of bringing this legislation forward is to reduce the demand for sex trafficking. We know that Nevada ranks in the top ten states for sex trafficking and this is driven by high demand from buyers. While this will not eliminate all of the demand, we know by data and the words of buyers themselves that if penalties are increased, the demand will reduce. Chair, with your permission, I am going to ask Ms. Jessica Kay to share her testimony. Following Ms. Kay, I would like Ms. Comis to walk you through the amendment.

Jessica Kay, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, NV:

Good morning. I am a sex trafficking survivor, and I was trafficked here in Nevada, primarily in Las Vegas. I am here to testify in support of A.B. 145. For roughly two years of my life, I was bought by men, women, married couples, groups, and by every age, race, and cultural identity that you can imagine. Buyers are people who purchase other people for their

own greed and lustful desires. I want to be very clear when I say that this is not a victimless crime. It is paid rape. Please understand that buyers are just as abusive as our traffickers.

People who are selling their bodies almost never do it freely, and if they can escape from this horrific crime, they will spend a lifetime trying to recover from the trauma that was inflicted upon them by the hands of other people. I have endured reproductive issues due to the lack of medical care as well as suffered from acute pelvic pain and irregular menstrual cycles. I have suffered from nightmares, and I have broken out all the back of my teeth from the biting down and grinding from the terror that I relive while I sleep. I suffer from anxiety, depression, and post-traumatic stress disorder. I struggle to trust people and my self-worth has always been tied to a transaction.

While I do wish the penalties in A.B. 145 were stiffer for buyers, I do believe it is a step in the right direction. We must work together to stop the culture of tolerance that surrounds the marketplace of commercial sexual exploitation. In order to decrease sex trafficking in our state, we must disrupt the demand by holding buyers accountable.

Regan Comis, representing Awaken:

Sexual exploitation and sex trafficking are complex problems with many causes, but the key driver is sex buyers. Without their money, pimps and traffickers have no incentive to force vulnerable women and men, girls and boys into the illegal sex trade. Nevada is facing a crisis. We are ranked second in the nation for human trafficking, according to a World Population Review report. Research in 2018 found that at least 5,016 individuals are sold for sex in an average month in Nevada [page 5, [Exhibit E](#)]. What is important is this figure excludes those who provide sex in licensed brothels.

Research on buyers found gendered cultural norms about sexuality, perceived risk of arrest, and individual attributes such as impulse controls are the driving factors behind the illegal purchase of sex. Buyers of sex or johns are almost exclusively men from all races, ethnicities, and socio-economic standing, although statistically, the predominant buyers of sex are middle-aged white males with disposable income.

Buyers who have participated in research on the illegal sex trade provided the following reasons for why they purchase sex: "Anything you cannot get from your girlfriend or wife, you can get from a prostitute," "I want to pay someone to do something a normal person would not do," and finally, "Being with a prostitute is like having a cup of coffee. Once you are done with it, you throw it out." These same buyers stated that they are most concerned about their own personal safety, sexual health, and freedom from arrest. In the 2018 report, "Who Buys Sex? Understanding and Disrupting Illicit Market Demand" [[Exhibit F](#)], both current and former buyers stated that if there were a risk of arrest and increased penalties, they would reconsider or altogether stop purchasing illicit sex in the future. Another study from 113 buyers found that 87 percent of participants stated that should their photo or name be published in the paper, it would be a deterrent. In the same study, 79 percent said the risk of their families or employer finding out they were arrested for solicitation would cause them to stop that behavior.

What is important for us to understand right now is the way the law currently works. If a buyer is caught for solicitation on their first offense, it is very similar to a traffic ticket. They get a citation, they pay their \$400 fine, and then they are able to seal their record in one year. Our focus in this bill is to simply reduce the demand and that in turn will reduce the amount of sex trafficking that we see in our state. I now will walk the Committee through the amendment that we have, and I am hoping everyone was able to get that on NELIS.

Working off the proposed amendment [[Exhibit D](#)], the amendment will completely replace the original bill. As we go into section 1, the fine as we noted is currently \$400 for a first offense. It will now be increased to \$800, but it still remains a misdemeanor for that first offense. There was a lot of language that was not intended to be added, and that is why there are a lot of deletions in this from the original bill. As you go down to section 1, subsection 7, there is a lot of orange language. That is language that is already existing in statute regarding "john schools" from previous legislation. It was not intended to be removed. It is just clarifying that that language will continue to be in statute.

Sections 2, 3, and 4 are being deleted by the amendment. Section 5 and 6, all of that is being deleted. When you go to section 7.3 [page 6], what we are doing is adding the solicitation for a buyer to prohibited offenses. That simply allows law enforcement the ability to arrest a buyer for a first offense solicitation. It does not require it, but it gives them the ability to do so. Going backwards for a minute, as we stated, a buyer is currently able to seal their records after one year. If we go to section 1, subsection 8 [page 3], that is where we are increasing the time frame for buyers to be able to seal their record from one year to two. If the Committee has questions, I am finished.

Chair Miller:

Thank you so much for that presentation and thank you for having your copresenter, a survivor, share her story as well. We appreciate that and applaud the courage. We do have a number of questions from members.

Assemblywoman Considine:

I know that you just mentioned that section 1, subsections 7 and 8 were originally in the statute and were accidentally removed and put back in. But the change is to two years after the date of the discharge, and then there is an automatic record sealing for johns, is that correct? Is that happening currently, an automatic record sealing? If it is, then I am a little perturbed that we have an automatic record sealing system for a predator but not for the victims.

Regan Comis:

Could you please rephrase that for me? I do not see where it is an automatic record sealing. Can you point me to that?

Assemblywoman Considine:

Absolutely. Reading the initial bill, not knowing that this came from the initial statute, that is where this question came from. If you look at section 1, subsection 8 [page 3, [Exhibit D](#)], the

first three lines, ". . . if a person is discharged and the proceedings against the person are dismissed pursuant to subsection 7, 2 years after the date of such discharge and dismissal, the court shall, without a hearing, order sealed all documents, papers and exhibits in the person's record, . . ." That to me is record sealing and if they are getting an automatic record sealing, I am wondering if that is actually happening. Also, this might be a little off, but I am just saying that it perturbed me that the john gets a record sealed automatically, but the victim does not because we do not have record sealings for victims of sex trafficking.

Regan Comis:

Thank you for the clarification. When we are looking at subsection 7, that is referring to the john school. Upon the completion of the john school, from there, there is a two-year sealing described in subsection 8. That already exists in statute. I would be welcome to an amendment that would make it not automatic sealing for the john and look to automatically seal for the victims of solicitation.

Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong:

Thank you to Assemblywoman Marzola and your copresenter. It takes a lot of courage, and I am grateful that she was able to come forward. My concern is about the police having the agency to decide who to arrest. I have two questions in that area. First, how is that being done in practice? I would also like to know information about currently where, speaking specifically for the area covered by Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (Metro), those arrests are being done? I know you may not have that information right now from our prior conversation, but I think that is really critical. It is important for me to know that there is no difference in where arrests are being made. If arrests are up to the police to do it at their own discretion, I am concerned that it may not be equitable. I think the data that you all provide will help us understand how that is being done. I would really love some feedback on that.

Regan Comis:

I appreciated the discussion that we had in your office. I do not represent Metro. I did share that request, but I do not know if they have been able to obtain that yet. I do believe there is a representative here and he can share that information with you to the best of his knowledge.

Scott Smith, Sergeant, Reno Police Department:

I can speak on northern Nevada as far as our john operations and how our demand reduction operations work. Typically, how that will work is they will be issued citations. As Ms. Comis said and statistics have shown, you get people that show up as johns from every race and economic status. We have chief executive officers to your day laborers. We obviously do not decide who shows up, but typically it is a citation. Obviously, we are trying to get the ability to arrest, which goes with trying to reduce that demand. If they are looking at an arrest as opposed to just a citation, hopefully they are going to think twice about showing up and following through with that. They do not want their family or their coworkers to find out, and right now, there are very few repercussions. It is kind of like a traffic citation where you simply pay your fine. Your family may not even find out, but if

you get arrested, if you have to go to court, if you are going to jail, more people are going to find out. Hopefully that gets some thinking that maybe I should not be doing this.

Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong:

We have the Super Bowl coming next year to Las Vegas. We have the theme, which I hate, "What happens in Vegas, stays in Vegas." That to me is an invitation for people to believe that they can come to our town, abuse our girls, and bring other people in to abuse them. And it is cool because, "What happens in Vegas, stays in Vegas." I have a problem with that. I believe, personally, if we are going to be serious about this, it should not be a maybe about arrest. I am sure that some of my police department folks might be mad at me, but I am a criminal justice person, and if it is not a "shall," then we will be choosing who gets arrested.

If you are high dollar with a \$40,000 Rolex and you get rolled, you can send the woman in to get arrested, but your picture is not on the front of the paper. I have a problem with that, and that is what we see all the time. If you look at the *Las Vegas Review-Journal* right now, you will see young women and their pictures who are there for potential rolling because they took something from somebody. Their pictures are there, but the johns' pictures are not. Why? Because they got a citation and the woman got accused of theft. I am really concerned, and I really would like to have a conversation with you all, the district attorneys and police departments. If you all can make time to talk to me about that and see where we can find some common ground, I would hope that we could get some language in that would be a bit more prescriptive and not allow as much wiggle room.

Assemblywoman Marzola:

Thank you for that statement. What I would like to do is absolutely get everybody in a room to have that conversation and have some language changes.

Scott Smith:

To start out, we are in complete agreement. That is what we are looking for and we want the ability to arrest every one of these guys. Every time we do a large sting, I send out a press release afterwards and their faces are plastered on the media. That is what we want, and I think we are in complete agreement. We want the ability to make an arrest as opposed to just issuing a citation.

Chair Miller:

I heard in there a question specifically as to who currently is being arrested. When the ability for discretion over who may be arrested is present, that is concerning, and it should not just be Las Vegas-focused or southern Nevada-focused. Is there a way that the Committee can be provided data on which johns are currently being arrested—because, again, it is discretionary—specifically relating to race and color? Because even though we know the majority of men, as you testified to, are white men with discretionary income, we want to see if that correlates with the arrests. Is there data for that specific information that could be submitted to the Committee?

Regan Comis:

We can definitely reach out and see what data we can provide to you. What I would like to note, and I believe it was submitted to the Committee, is that there is a report titled, "Who Buys Sex? Understanding and Disrupting Illicit Market Demand," that does outline the percentages of buyers and who they are [[Exhibit F](#)]. It is not Nevada-specific, it is a national report, but it may be a resource for the Committee.

Chair Miller:

We understand who buys, we just want to make sure that correlates to who gets arrested. When you are reporting that everyone from day laborers to executives are buyers, we can understand that. However, the equity question was based on the equity of who gets arrested. We would like to have some follow-up at some point to that.

Scott Smith:

To provide some information on this topic, right now our hands are kind of tied per the statute. If they do qualify for a citation, we cite them. A lot of times we are posing as purchasers or on the prostitution side, my detectives will be posing as prostitutes. If we can show that they have clearly been doing this before through the language that they are using in the chats, then we can have a little more justification for arrest, showing that they have a history and will likely continue that activity. But typically, we are kind of bound by statute, and if they do qualify for the citation, then we cite them.

Chair Miller:

That is what we are trying to get to: equitable criminal justice to be delivered the same way per situation and circumstance without discretion being based on any other factor. If we could pull those statistics at some point, we would be very interested in seeing the statistics of who is getting arrested.

Assemblywoman Cohen:

Thank you for the presentation, especially Ms. Kay. This goes along with what my colleagues were just asking about. You have told us that if buyers know that an arrest is going to become public or if their family is going to find out, they will not do it. As my colleague mentioned, the infamous phrase, "What happens in Vegas, stays in Vegas," is the unfortunate standard. What is happening at the front end, when people are getting into town, such as getting off the highway or arriving to the airport? What is happening to make sure they understand? We have signs at the airport now that say smoking marijuana in public is not legal. What are we doing to let men know that buying prostitutes in Clark County or in Washoe County is not legal?

Regan Comis:

I appreciate the question. In the exhibits for the presentation today, you will see a report card from both Shared Hope International Institute for Justice and Advocacy [[Exhibit G](#)] as well as the Guinn Center [[Exhibit H](#)]. Those are recommendations to work on education programs to highlight what is and what is not allowed when you come into a state. With that said, I do think when individuals are traveling, when I am traveling out of state; it is, I am an

adult and it is my responsibility to know what is and is not permissible when I am traveling. I think that Sergeant Smith can also share some information on this, but we do know that buyers are going on forums where they are discussing what is and what is not allowed when they are traveling. So, I think there is a little bit more information there.

Scott Smith:

First of all, I would love billboards all over the place as you enter into the state to serve as a reminder. But what we will see as we go through their phones is, especially with the johns coming across the state line, they will Google questions. "Is prostitution legal in Washoe County," or "Is prostitution legal in Carson City," or even, "What is the age of consent in Nevada?" They are doing that research before they get here, and we do a lot of trainings and a lot of public awareness, but I would like to see more, such as bus benches, more signage at the airport, or more billboards on the highway. It is something we can all work on to do that.

Chair Miller:

I do not necessarily agree that tourists are saying, "Let me see what is legal." It is Vegas, and it has been decades of this no-consequence mantra. For example, I remember being a kid in very close proximity to Canada and being told marijuana is legal in Canada. We were not saying, "Let us look that up and make sure." We were saying, "Wait, you can smoke weed in Canada." By the way, you could not at the time, but this is Vegas and because we do have legalized prostitution here in the state, that adds to more confusion. They do not know where the county lines or boundaries are or what the *Nevada Revised Statutes* say. I do agree we need much more public communication and training.

Same with marijuana right now. People do not know where, how, or when it is legal to consume. I think Metro would agree that there is a question about how tourists are supposed to know. There is no little card in the hotel room, nothing in the airport, and nothing in the back of the stalls in the bathrooms. I think we do need an education campaign to educate people more because I fall on the assumption that when people come to Vegas, they think it is a free-for-all.

Assemblyman Gray:

I have concerns as well about Super Bowl next year. I do not think it will just be our girls that are getting victimized. I think we are going to see an influx of vendors with their wares and that is kind of scary as well. Thank you for bringing this forward. For a serial offender, I would like to see them have to register as a Tier 1 sex offender. That is what these guys are. It is a sexual offense. I do not think there is any question about that, but I would like to see them get their one warning only. I would not mind seeing a provision for a mandatory arrest like what we have in domestic violence. Whether it is still a cite and release, but even if it is on the side of the road, do a booking photo, do the citation, and arrest if needed. That way it still gets processed, and we do not influx the jails. We must do something to protect the victims and stop the demand. The only way we are going to do this is to stop the demand.

Regan Comis:

When we were bringing this provision forward, we were focusing just on the first offense and not making additional changes to the second and third. This is because we are trying to get that initial demand reduced, but we would welcome additional conversations with you.

Assemblyman Gray:

These gentlemen, and I will use the word lightly, need the fear of God struck into them.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

Thank you for being here and thank you for bringing the bill. This is more of a rhetorical question, but at a time where we have a majority female legislature, would it not be a great show of consistency in the state by letting us just ban legal prostitution? But I digress and know that that is a highly controversial subject. I am very disappointed that the bill had to morph to the degree that it did. I think there was a lot more meat and I would have liked to have seen that stay. I know you have worked with stakeholders. I appreciate that. My concern, if it is something you can talk on the record about, is what stumbling blocks were encountered and why could we not get to where we might have wanted to with the original bill? Is there anything that we can know on the record about what we are still trying to work through? I understand the arrest side, but I am not understanding the john school, why that is not part of the bill. Am I correct on that?

Regan Comis:

The john school provision is still a part of the bill. What had happened is in the original version, by making it a gross misdemeanor, that then moved the jurisdiction up to the district court and district court does not have jurisdiction over the john schools. That is why keeping it to a misdemeanor, which it currently is, allowed the john school provision to continue to stay in. This process takes compromise and yes, there was concern we have heard about making it a mandatory arrest as well as the time frame for record sealing. There was quite a bit of discussion around that, and this is where we landed. Obviously, we can continue to have more discussions. It is still early in the process.

Assemblywoman La Rue Hatch:

Thank you for bringing this critical issue. I echo the concerns of my colleagues. I am glad that we are going after the buyers because I think that is the only thing that will address this. I think that we need to have mandatory arrests and to make sure that process is equitable. My question is about the public shaming. The belief is if they know it is going to be publicized, then they will not do it as much. With that in mind, is there a database where we are keeping a record and we are publishing these people's names and photos? You said sometimes they are in the newspaper, but not always. Is there some way we can standardize this reporting of who is partaking in this?

Scott Smith:

What happens currently is, when we do our big operations, our big stings, I will send information out to do the press release and then the media will follow up and get their booking photos to publish. On the typical everyday arrest where we only cite or arrest one or

two, they do not always get thrown into the media. It is usually just the bigger operations that the media will follow up on and put their pictures on television and on social media.

Chair Miller:

I would just like to clarify because I believe I understand the intention of Committee members that we would want required across the board arrests for the johns. We are not saying that about the women. I see heads nodding and I believe we are all in agreement throughout the room. Would you like to speak to that?

Regan Comis:

We are in absolute complete agreement with you. Yes.

Assemblywoman Marzola:

Yes. The whole point of this bill is to reduce the demand and completely, 100 percent concentrate on the johns, also known as the buyers.

Scott Smith:

Just to clarify, the HEAT [Human Exploitation and Trafficking] unit has been up and running for just over three years and in that time, we have not arrested one sex worker for any kind of prostitution charge. Our goal is to get them resources and get them out of this life.

Chair Miller:

With that, I will go ahead and open it up to testimony. Those who wish to provide testimony in support of Assembly Bill 145 here in Carson City, you will have up to two minutes.

Jason Walker, Sergeant, Administrative Division, Legislative Liaison, Washoe County Sheriff's Office:

Thank you to the bill sponsors for bringing this forward. We realize that this a large problem in Washoe County as well. Sergeant Smith and the resources that he has available are busy all the time. I have noted as much as I could as the Committee members were throwing out their concerns and will happily assist Sergeant Smith in gathering stats and would be happy to circle back with our findings. I am testifying in support of A.B. 145.

Christopher M. Ries, Detective, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:

I want to thank Assemblywoman Marzola for bringing this important legislation which we believe will help hold buyers more accountable. Part of this bill fixes what we also believe was an oversight of A.B. 440 of the 81st Session, which would not allow us to arrest johns. For this reason, we support A.B. 145.

John T. Jones, Jr., Chief Deputy District Attorney, Legislative Liaison, Clark County District Attorney's Office; and representing Nevada District Attorneys Association:

We are here in support of A.B. 145 with the amendment, and we do want to thank Assemblywoman Marzola for bringing the bill.

Nicole Reilly, Ombudsman for Domestic Violence, Sexual Assault and Human Trafficking, Office of the Attorney General:

I am so excited and encouraged by all of the comments, questions, and the understanding of this issue. Honestly, it comes through very clearly that you all are committed to eradicating the violence and the crime that we are talking about today. I am super excited about hopefully making it a mandatory arrest for every buyer that they come across. Thank you, and we are in support of this bill.

Debra Sisco, Finance Officer, Xquisite, Carson City, Nevada:

I am from Xquisite, and we are a resource to victims and survivors of sex trafficking and domestic violence here in Carson City. We are in support of this bill and are a resource to anyone that would ever need to reach out.

Liz Ortenburger, Chief Executive Officer, SafeNest:

We, among our work with domestic and sexual assault victims, work at the intersectionality of those victims and trafficking. Every survivor we work with in trafficking, there is an absolute fear that as they escape, we create a vacancy for a new survivor to be created. The only way to stop the endless cycle of sex trafficking victimization is to work to end the demand. This bill does that. We are in full support, and thank you to Assemblywoman Marzola for bringing such important legislation forward.

Pamela Del Porto, Executive Director, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association:

We are in support of [A.B. 145](#).

Lauren Boitel, Chair, Nevada Policy Council on Human Trafficking:

The Nevada Policy Council on Human Trafficking is a diverse cross-section of community leaders and survivors from the public, private, and nongovernmental organization sectors coming together to pursue collaborative, long-term, systemic strategies to decrease sex trafficking in our state. We applaud Assemblywoman Marzola for her work and leadership on this bill. We feel this is an important step in the right direction towards recognizing the severity of the crime of human trafficking, more appropriately penalizing illegal buyers, and protecting victims from repeat offenders, even if just for one additional year. There is still a lot of work to be done, and we would like to see the level of the offense increase, fines increase further, required arrest, and longer length of record sealing for buyers. However, [A.B. 145](#) is important progress, and we respectfully request your support of this bill.

Dawn Christensen, Vice President of Communications and Corporate Responsibility, Nevada Resort Association:

We want to thank Vice Chair Marzola for bringing attention to this issue, and we would like to offer our support of [A.B. 145](#) with the proposed amendment.

[[Exhibit I](#), [Exhibit J](#), [Exhibit K](#), and [Exhibit L](#) were submitted but not discussed and will become a part of the record in support of [A.B. 145](#).]

Chair Miller:

I will go ahead and open up testimony for anyone in opposition to Assembly Bill 145.

Victoria McMahon, Community Organizer, Las Vegas Red Umbrella Collective:

I am calling in opposition to this amendment. We have seen that steeper penalties for johns lead sex workers, regardless of whether or not they are in the industry by choice, to make more risky decisions in order to placate the needs of johns. Research on the Nordic model used in places like Sweden shows that the most marginalized will be harmed by measures penalizing and criminalizing johns as they are further forced underground and away from resources. Decriminalization is the most appropriate path forward and will provide people who are victims access to resources without being caught in the criminal justice system, a system that we know is often heavily biased against the most marginalized among us.

Chair Miller:

I will open it up for neutral testimony at this time. [There was none.] With that, I will close testimony. We appreciate you all bringing this bill forward, and I will close the hearing on Assembly Bill 145. Our last bill of the day is Assembly Bill 157. Assembly Bill 157 revises provisions relating to the crime of living from the earnings of a prostitute. With that, I will open the hearing to A.B. 157 and welcome Assemblywoman Taylor.

Assembly Bill 157: Revises provisions relating to the crime of living from the earnings of a prostitute. (BDR 15-641)

Assemblywoman Angie Taylor, Assembly District No. 27:

I am here to present Assembly Bill 157 for your consideration. Thank you for the opportunity. You are familiar with my copresenters, and so we will go ahead and continue with a little background information on this bill.

Sex trafficking is a pervasive national problem. In 2022 more than 19,000 reports of possible child sex trafficking were received by the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. Here in Nevada, the National Human Trafficking Hotline received 571 calls in 2021 and identified from there almost 300 victims, 296 exactly. However, this data still does not show the full picture. Sex trafficking is a hidden crime where victims are forced or coerced into commercial sexual exploitation without their consent. Traffickers often use tactics such as threats, violence, intimidation, and manipulation to control their victims. Victims of sex trafficking may not report the crime due to their fear of retribution from their traffickers, fear of law enforcement or immigration authorities, coupled with shame, embarrassment, or sometimes a lack of understanding of their rights. This makes it very difficult for law enforcement and researchers to accurately estimate the true scope of this problem.

As a former member of the Washoe County School District Board of Trustees, I have been made aware, before I left the board, that there is sex trafficking actually happening within our own school district and across the state. Assembly Bill 157 specifies the penalties for a crime of living off the earnings of a prostitute committed against the victim who is a child.

That is what this bill targets because oftentimes the trafficking and the grooming, in particular, begins as early as middle school.

Let me give you a little bit of information as I walk you through the bill. Assembly Bill 157 specifies those penalties, and what we are asking for are a couple of changes. If physical force or the immediate threat of physical force is used against a victim who is a child, the penalty currently is a category B felony which has a prison term of 3 to 10 years. If there is no physical force or the immediate threat of physical force is used against a victim who is a child, the penalty is a category B felony with a prison term of 1 to 10 years. Lastly, the penalties for this crime committed against the victim who is an adult will remain the same. Those two changes are what we are asking for when the victim is a child. Anything to disincentivize this abhorrent behavior should certainly be done. I would now like to turn it over to Regan Comis to share additional information.

Regan Comis, representing Awaken:

As Assemblywoman Taylor mentioned, Nevada is a top destination for those who seek to sexually exploit children. The Federal Bureau of Investigation has identified Las Vegas as one of the 13 high-intensity child trafficking areas. According to the U. S. Department of Justice, the average age a child first becomes a victim of sex trafficking is between 12 and 14 years old, although we have seen victims younger. Of the children who are commercially sexually exploited, studies have also shown us that 84 percent were sexually abused prior to being trafficked. Children who are involved in the child welfare agencies are particularly vulnerable to sex trafficking. Traffickers identify, groom, and exploit these vulnerable children selling their bodies for financial benefit. Buyers pay more for younger sex victims, suggesting, therefore, there is a higher demand for younger victims. So we see increased recruitment of our children.

I would like to just note that there are two letters that have been submitted to the Committee [[Exhibit J](#) and [Exhibit K](#)]. We had two survivors that were unable to be able to attend in person to share their story. I do not want to take the time to read both those letters here on the record, but they are there, and I just wanted to make sure that the Committee saw those. As Assemblywoman Taylor noted, the bill currently has language for an adult. We are just trying to differentiate that if you are living off the earnings of a minor, that should be an increased penalty.

We do have a conceptual amendment that we would like to share with you. As you will see in section 1, it denotes the use of physical force or not the use of physical force. We are dealing with minors, and so I do not think there needs to be a differentiation. What we would like to have it say is, "Where the victim is a child, it is a category B felony," and eliminate the two pieces. Therefore, if it is a minor, no other qualifications would be necessary, and it would be a category B felony.

Scott Smith, Sergeant, Reno Police Department:

I think this just makes sense. We differentiate between everything else for an offense with an adult versus a juvenile. If you are earning money off of a juvenile, you should have a greater

penalty than if you are earning money off an adult. We separate everything else, so it just makes sense.

Assemblywoman Taylor:

That concludes our presentation, and we are happy to answer any questions that the Committee may have.

Chair Miller:

Thank you for your presentation. First, before we begin questions, I would like to ask you to submit that proposal in writing to us.

Assemblywoman Taylor:

Absolutely, Madam Chair.

Assemblywoman Newby:

I know sometimes children can be trafficked for multiple years. What happens in the instance when a trafficker is caught, the victim is now an adult, but has been trafficking that person for years prior when that person was a child?

Scott Smith:

Thankfully with the statute of limitations, we can go back and charge them according to the timeline while they were trafficking the juvenile. We can take into account the whole duration and go back and charge them with the harsher penalty of the juvenile.

Assemblywoman La Rue Hatch:

I totally agree with what you are bringing to us, and I appreciate that you have brought it this morning. I have heard some concern that many of these victims pool their money, and so if they are picked up together and one of them is holding the money for the rest, then they would be charged with this crime. Obviously, we are not trying to harm victims here, and I was just wondering if you could speak to that specific issue.

Scott Smith:

If you have two victims and they are both in possession of money, and then you have your trafficker, we would charge the trafficker for both the violations for an adult and the juvenile.

Assemblywoman La Rue Hatch:

I would like to clarify my question. Let us say there is a group of girls, ages 14 to 18. The 18-year-old is holding all the money that the girls have collected for the night because she is the one that is in charge of holding all the money. I had some constituents come to my office with concerns that in this scenario the 18-year-old would be charged as the trafficker because she is holding all the money. She technically has the money from the proceeds of minor victims. I just wondered if you could speak to whether that would be the case if they are picked up and not the actual person that is the trafficker. What would happen in that scenario?

Scott Smith:

Thank you for that clarification and I understand your question now. Typically, in a case like that, through our investigation we would be able to show that the 18-year-old is more likely a victim. This specific role in this scenario is what is called, "the bottom," the most trusted prostitute for lack of a better term. We will be able to show that she is still under the control of the trafficker and charge the trafficker accordingly, not the victim.

Chair Miller:

I do not see any other questions at this time. I would like to open it up for testimony in support of Assembly Bill 157.

Christopher M. Ries, Detective, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:

We want to thank Assemblywoman Taylor for bringing this bill and we support A.B. 157.

Jason Walker, Sergeant, Washoe County Sheriff's Office; and representing Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association:

We are appreciative of the efforts in bringing this bill forward and are testifying in support for Washoe County Sheriff's Office and Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association.

Nicole Reilly, Ombudsman for Domestic Violence, Sexual Assault and Human Trafficking, Office of the Attorney General:

We are testifying in support of this bill.

Kelli Radnothy, representing Xquisite, Carson City, Nevada:

We are in support of A.B. 157.

Brigid J. Duffy, Assistant District Attorney, Juvenile Division, Clark County District Attorney's Office; and representing Nevada District Attorneys Association:

We are in support of A.B. 157.

Serena Evans, Policy Director, Nevada Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence:

Simply put, we support any measure to hold perpetrators of trafficking minors accountable.

Tessyn Opferman, representing Nevada Women's Lobby:

We, too, are in support.

Dawn Christensen, Vice President of Communications and Corporate Responsibility, Nevada Resort Association:

I would like to thank all the sponsors behind this bill. We see this as another important bill in addressing and ending human trafficking and child trafficking. We offer our support of A.B. 157. Thanks again for the opportunity to speak with you today.

Liz Ortenburger, Chief Executive Officer, SafeNest:

We fully support this bill and thank Assemblywoman Taylor for bringing it forward.

Lauren Boitel, Chair, Nevada Policy Council on Human Trafficking:

We support A.B. 157.

[[Exhibit M](#) and [Exhibit N](#) were submitted but not discussed and will become part of the record in support of A.B. 157.]

Chair Miller:

I will go ahead and open it up for testimony in opposition to Assembly Bill 157.

Erica Roth, Government Affairs Liaison, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's Office:

I am here to testify in opposition of A.B. 157 this morning. I want to start off by saying that I sincerely appreciate the nuanced conversations that we have been having about trafficking and sex work this morning. Those are two distinct things. Sex work is work; trafficking is a crime. This morning, and specific to A.B. 157, I want to say that I care deeply about victims of sex trafficking because they are my clients, too, and I want to highlight their stories this morning, stories of women who are overwhelmingly women of color, who are brought into the criminal justice system because of their proximity to sex trafficking.

This charge, living off the earnings of a prostitute, I see in two ways: one, to stack charges and force plea deals, and two, is working against victims of sex trafficking. I think it is important to point out the culture around sex trafficking. There are often multiple victims who are controlled by the same pimp. I have seen women brought in, in chains to courtrooms after being prosecuted for living off the earnings of a prostitute. We have continued to criminalize sex trafficking over the last ten years.

It is a category A felony to traffic a child. That conduct is covered, right? We cannot make that penalty any higher. What we can do is risk bringing more people into the system to continue to be victimized, once by their pimp, and then again by an unjust system. It is really important to understand how these charges affect victims, because they do. I appreciate the callers who have called in so far, and I appreciate the stories of victim-survivors this morning. Everyone's experience is different. We are in opposition to A.B. 157. We appreciate the stories of everyone today, but this is a nuanced conversation that requires a nuanced policy decision, and this simply does not solve that issue.

Jim Hoffman, representing Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice:

I would like to echo the testimony just given by Ms. Roth. We also have one other policy issue that we wanted to highlight, and that relates to LGBT kids or teens who are forced out of their homes because they are gay or transgender; they unfortunately can turn to survival sex work. They are not necessarily being trafficked. No particular person is forcing them to. Homophobia is forcing them to. If these kids live together, they support each other economically. That could technically get them prosecuted for living off the earnings of a prostitute. We do not want this to be misinterpreted as something that could be used to go after victims of sex trafficking. That is just another concern that I wanted to add for the Committee's consideration.

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

We would like to echo the sentiments of Ms. Roth and Mr. Hoffman. We are fully against sex trafficking. What it is important for the Committee to know is you cannot voluntarily live off the earnings of a child prostitute. That is sex trafficking and is covered under *Nevada Revised Statutes* 201.300. That should be that way because unlike the people who oppose A.B. 157, we all understand that for a child, it is not voluntary. It could not be voluntary. If this body wants to put another crime on the books to stack charges against people, that is fine. Recognize that, with all due respect, the police do not do the best job of separating a victim from a trafficker when it comes to the women who are under the control of a pimp. We find that in our practice frequently. We are concerned that this will be used against victims, despite how they claim to do a good job of differentiating and recognizing the difference. It has been our experience that that is not the case. That is the reason that we oppose this.

Perhaps a better fix would be to take care of kids in the foster system and go to the money committees to fix both child poverty and our welfare system so that children are not turning to despicable actors in our system to survive.

Victoria McMahon, Community Organizer, Las Vegas Red Umbrella Collective:

It is great to see all these nuanced conversations around sex work and sex trafficking. Once again, I would like to echo what the people before me have said. Sex trafficking of minors is already crime. It is already a crime to take a child and traffic them. Laws like this open the door for more situations where victims can be revictimized and traumatized by the criminal justice system. I believe one of the Assemblywomen stated before, there could be a situation where there are 14- to 18-year-old girls who may be working independently, or they may be working under a pimp. There are ways for laws like this to continue to harm them and not necessarily take down sex traffickers.

There needs to be more of a nuanced conversation, and I would really love to see organizers or people working on bills like these reaching out to sex work organizations. A lot of sex workers have been trafficked and have been in the industry since they were teenagers or even children. They would be able to offer a nuanced perspective on this. For the people who are writing these amendments in these bills, I highly encourage you to reach out to people that you may not see eye to eye with but will still agree that sex trafficking children is bad and want to come to a nuanced determination of what we can do to go forward.

Chair Miller:

I will now go ahead and open it up for testimony in neutral. [There was no one.] With that I will close testimony and welcome the bill sponsor back up for some final remarks.

Assemblywoman Taylor:

First of all, I really want to just say that I appreciate and respect the testimonies of those who called in, in opposition, out of concern for the victims. In fact, I did meet with some of the people who testified in opposition and continue to stay open for those who want to continue

to have a conversation. I think that is important. I also want to state that everyone who testified in support also did so in support to advocate for and to stand for victims. Let us not forget the victims. It is already in statute that it is illegal to live off the earnings of a prostitute. That is already there. What this is saying is that it should be an increased penalty if that prostitute who has been trafficked is indeed a child. As elected officials, our number one responsibility is to keep people safe. That includes the safety and well-being of all Nevadans. I would submit that that especially means the children. Those who are the most vulnerable.

I thank you so much, Madam Chair, for the opportunity to present this bill. Thank you so much to the Committee, and I look forward to our next steps.

Chair Miller:

Thank you, Assemblywoman Taylor. I will go ahead and close the hearing for A.B. 157. That was our last bill for the day. Our next order of business is public comment.

[Public comment was heard.]

I will go ahead and close public comment. I want to thank everyone, all of the members, and everyone participating today, for your engagement, especially in such a sensitive and important issue. We have concluded our business for today. We will begin Monday morning at 9 a.m. Have a great weekend. This meeting is adjourned.

The meeting adjourned [at 10:53 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Aaron Klatt
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Brittney Miller, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is a proposed amendment to [Assembly Bill 183](#), dated March 2, 2023, submitted by Jeffrey Rogan, Senior Attorney, Civil Division, Clark County District Attorney's Office; and presented by Brigid J. Duffy, Assistant District Attorney, Juvenile Division, Clark County District Attorney's Office.

[Exhibit D](#) is a proposed amendment to [Assembly Bill 145](#), dated February 22, 2023, submitted and presented by Assemblywoman Elaine Marzola, Assembly District No. 21.

[Exhibit E](#) is a report titled, "Nevada's Online Commercial Sex Market," prepared by The Human Trafficking Initiative, submitted by Regan Comis, Government Affairs Director, R&R Partners.

[Exhibit F](#) is a report titled, "Who Buys Sex? Understanding and Disrupting Illicit Market Demand," dated November 2018, prepared by Demand Abolition, submitted by Assemblywoman Elaine Marzola, Assembly District No. 21.

[Exhibit G](#) is a document titled, "Nevada 2022 Report Card on Child & Youth Sex Trafficking," prepared by Shared Hope International Institute for Justice & Advocacy, submitted by Regan Comis, Government Affairs Director, R&R Partners.

[Exhibit H](#) is a document titled, "Southern Nevada's Sex Trafficking Response: Selected Gaps and Policy Recommendations," prepared by Guinn Center, submitted by Regan Comis, Government Affairs Director, R&R Partners.

[Exhibit I](#) is written testimony dated February 24, 2023, signed by Katie Roe Ryan, System Director, Nevada Government Relations, Dignity Health-St. Rose Dominican, in support of [Assembly Bill 145](#).

[Exhibit J](#) is written testimony, submitted by Tamara McGiffin, Private Citizen, in support of [Assembly Bill 145](#)

[Exhibit K](#) is written testimony, submitted by Bekah Charleston, Chief Executive Officer, Charleston Law Center, Reno, Nevada, in support of [Assembly Bill 145](#)

[Exhibit L](#) is written testimony dated February 23, 2023, submitted by Tomas Perez, Chief Executive Officer, The Epik Project, Vancouver, Washington, in support of [Assembly Bill 145](#).

[Exhibit M](#) is written testimony dated February 24, 2023, signed by Katie Roe Ryan, System Director, Nevada Government Relations, Dignity Health-St. Rose Dominican, in support of Assembly Bill 157.

[Exhibit N](#) is a letter dated February 27, 2023, signed by Brenda Sandquist, Executive Director, Xquisite, Carson City, Nevada, in support of Assembly Bill 157.