



## Registry Matters Podcast

Episode 163

Recorded 1-30-21

Andy 00:00

Registry Matters is an independent production. The opinions and ideas here are that of the hosts and do not reflect the opinions of any other organization. If you have a problem with these thoughts, fyp. Recording live from FYP Studios, east and west, using my cellular phone to connect, transmitting across the internet. This is Episode 163 of Registry Matters. Happy Saturday night, Larry. It's like, I don't know it's freezing cold here again, we had 70-degree weather and now it's cold again.

Larry 00:30

Well it has been cold here. But it was kind of milder today, it was close to 50 or so I think.

Andy 00:36

that's almost like a heat wave.

Larry 00:38

It really is.

Andy 00:41

What do we have on the docket for this evening?

Larry 00:44

Well, we've got a lot of good stuff, we've got a patron only extra. We're gonna talk about finance.

Andy 00:52

Okay.

Larry 00:53

Can you believe that our registry program talking about Wall Street and finance in a Patreon extra, like, what kind of crack stuff is that?

Andy 01:03

Someone in chat, so we were talking about some things before and after. And then this comes up from that Facebook thing we talked about. So this is a teaser, if you're not on Patreon that that you should you should go sign up for a buck and go get this episode at least but someone said that, gosh, I wish Larry were my teacher last year when I had this accounting class, I sure would have understood stuff better. You do have a pretty good way of explaining things and dumbing it down so to speak.

Larry 01:26

Well when you're dumb yourself, that's only that's the only way you can do it.

Andy 01:31

Ah, I gotcha. I like it. All right. So that'll that'll come out in a few days over on Patreon. It'll be, it'll be about GameStop.

Larry 01:38

We got, we've got a comment from one of our readers, I have to learn to distinguish between readers and listeners. And we've got we've got some questions. And we've got a comprehensive question that's going to be fascinating because it involves interstate movement of an offender.

Andy 01:57

Not interstate compacts again, is it?

Larry 02:00

Well, that is indirectly involved in this situation. And we're gonna talk about some more on the House Bill 56, and the legislative process, so it's gonna it's gonna be jam packed full of action.

Andy 02:15

Fanfrickintastic well, then I guess we should just, we should dive right in. And we will start with this letter from Anthony says:

### *Listener Comment*

Dear Andy, and Larry, I got profiled, Larry like for once this is like in big capital letters. I'm so honored. What a great start to 2021 to read my letter published in the only podcast transcript I subscribed to. I'm still occasionally laughing that Andy felt left out of my letter of appreciation for the Christmas cards. In my defense, I addressed my letter exactly how my Christmas card greeted me not that I don't appreciate Andy asking Larry to clarify legal terminology and implications. I took the Blackstone paralegal program just so I can understand the laws that will affect me for most likely the rest of my life. And that's why I can really benefit from Andy's, "Wait a second. What's that mean? Explain that." Also, I appreciate Larry for continuing to send me the transcripts what I thought was a fluke was a very generous sales pitch. The synopsis of *Hope v. Indiana DOC* is well written and easy to understand I'm glad it was included with the transcript. When I was in the army being told thank you for your service was always met with a well-practiced smile and a thank you for your support. There are a few times did the interaction feel genuine but for you to see the address on my name and continue to send me information for free based on at least partially the fact that I serve the country I can tell it's genuine. Come August of this year, I'll be out mandatory supervised release. And I'll be sure to join and listen in when I can. Thanks again guys. And especially Andy, who's definitely mistreated See, see this man, I appreciate it very much. I will be sending you checks this week. Do you need a package? Does that come up here soon? Let me know.

Larry 04:03

Alrighty, well. So yes, we appreciate, and it was partially marketing. We're trying to get a few more subscribers and that particular facility that houses only military people in Fort Leavenworth, so that was part of the plan. But we appreciate all of them. Every everyone who did the duty, we appreciate each and every one of them.

Andy 04:30

Fantastic. I got to tell you just like a little personal side thing when someone says thank you for your service always feels very awkward. There were a whole lot of other reasons that I had joined. It wasn't necessarily out of patriotism though. You know, later in life, maybe you come up and have a more patriotic attitude towards the country. But I was a musician. And this was the only place that I could really go and get a steady paycheck and collect some college money, get a paycheck, 30 days paid vacation, like it's a job. It's not like you... there are plenty of there are

people that go join for those patriotic reasons, but I didn't do it at that time. It feels weird when people say that.

Larry 05:06

well, I'm sure when you're 18, 19, 22 years old that that, that there would be some that would join for the, for the fun of traveling around and having port calls in all these countries. But the bottom line is even if they cannot perceive it at the time, they can be called on in a moment's notice, to go into a very dangerous situation. And if you're not willing to do that, where would we be if we didn't have people who are willing to go into dangerous situations? So they don't know when they're going to be deployed, they don't know where they're gonna be separated from their families, and they don't know when they're gonna have rounds of ammunition coming their direction.

Andy 05:48

Yes, absolutely. All right. Well, then we will move on to number two, which I believe is this. (Larry: Question number one.) Yes, this will be question number one.

Larry 05:59

Well, there's one called questions this one. Yep.

Andy 06:05

Yeah, this is.

#### *Listener Question*

I am in Kentucky serving 25 years on a class A felony. In Kentucky, we are required to serve 85% of our sentence upon completion of SOTP sex offender treatment programs. Upon completing 85% of our sentence, we are released and required to complete an additional SOTP class on the street while serving a five year conditional discharge. This conditional discharge is basically parole with all the added rules for sex offenders as well as registering. During this five-year conditional discharge, I know I will be limited in my ability to travel. I wish to know what obstacles I may face when applying for a passport. Can I do this during this five-year conditional discharge? Once I'm done with my sins and only have the registry to contend with, how will my international travel be affected? Oh, boy, let's say I want a six-month work visa to Italy and then once they apply for citizenship, is that a feasible option of being a registered offender? Thank you for your input and what you guys do and NARSOL is awesome. Please keep it going. Wow, okay, go at it Larry.

Larry 07:10

There's gonna be a number of questions here. You won't have any problem with getting the passport. The passport you get may be marked depending on what type of conviction you have. It's not all sexual offenses that get a marked passport. So your your offenses against children, minors, you may end up with a marked passport. There are people who have what appear to be qualifying offenses. And sometimes they apply for passports and they do not come through marked. So, we cannot tell you whether it'll be marked. But if you've got the money, and if you're an eligible person, meaning if you were born in the United States, or if you have if you have the requisite citizenship, you can hold a US passport. You can hold it while you're on probation. And there shouldn't be a problem getting the passport. But then beyond that was questions about traveling, you're never going to have any problem leaving

the United States, you can leave the United States all you want to. And people really get angry when I say this, the problem you're going to have is that your destination in your country of origin, they may choose not to admit you. Because the information that's required of a person in United States who is registered to file in advance, 21 days in advance their travel plans will result in a notification go into your destination country. And they may decide that they don't want you, which is what the United States does when we receive those notices. We decide we don't want those people here.

Andy 08:42

I'm thinking about extreme vetting?

Larry 08:45

Yes, I didn't want to go there. But yes, we did have a recent president who did, who did advocate for extreme vetting of anybody who wants to enter the United States. But But you won't have any trouble. But the American side will not intercept you. And I say that with a qualification. If you haven't filed the necessary 21 day advance notice, they may intercept you, but it's not because you're traveling, is because you didn't comply with the law of the notice. And if you've had the requisite notice, if you've signed acknowledgement saying you know you're required to give this this 21 days' notice, they may intercept you for that. And and that's what's your pleasure prosecution before it would not be for travel. If you gave the requisite notice, they'd be happy to let you let you sail off or fly off into the sunset. But you may be turned around once you get there. In terms of about the citizenship that is totally totally out of my in terms of what Italy might do. I don't have any information on that. I would suggest that he connect with the Registrant Travel Action Group, our tag when he gets out is going to have it up. Yeah, they have they have much more information than we do. But it might be a possibility, but I'd say the odds are no.

Andy 09:59

I kind of dumb it down for myself this way, a place that you would want to go, you probably cannot go. But a lot of places in Europe are available to go and then the places that you wouldn't want to go, they probably wouldn't have any problem you coming in. And I'm being super generalized, but I'm, you know, if you went to a country in the middle of Africa that has, you know, the average income of like, \$1 a year some, you know, ridiculously impoverished country, like, they probably wouldn't give a crap, if you came in, they probably wouldn't have the resources to check on anything. They're happy a plane landed.

Larry 10:29

That has been generally true. But I was on a on a flight in the last couple of years where I talked to a diplomat from one of those countries, and I don't recollect which one it was and when she asked me what I do, and I told her part of what I do in my second life, she told me that that was actually being pushed by the Agency for International Development that those countries adopt registries, and that they be very circumspect in terms of who they admit, based on the, they have a particular vulnerability, their poverty makes them more vulnerable to sexual trafficking, because the teenagers, the teenagers are without resources, and you'd be more likely as an affluent Westerner, to come into those

nations and exploit their minors. So she told me that that was not necessarily the case that you'd be welcome there.

Andy 11:17

Tell me real quick about how the passport is marked. Is it some big like, red stop sign saying pedo? Whatever?

Larry 11:25

No, it's on the endorsements page at the back. And I don't have a marked passport. But I've seen one, a picture of it. And it says that this person has a conviction in US pursuant to such and such section of US law. And and I would, having not traveled with one, I don't know how often people flip to the back of your passport book. And I don't know what type of impediment it causes. I think probably that notice the electronic notification is probably your biggest obstacle. Because when you deplane I'm guessing that you get a special diversion to to align to to be told we don't want you here. But I don't I don't know how that works.

Andy 12:06

Do you think that the person that you're doing the passport with, I call that immigration at the moment, do you think that they have that pulled up or do they just get some sort of flag that says send this person off into the alternate line? And you know, you get some handler takes care of you from there? Do you think that the person, just the the the daily worker, they're checking passports, do they think that they have that information pull up?

Larry 12:29

I'm imagining they do because the passport when you give your passport to your registry official in America, they put it into the system, they put your passport number, your name and stuff. My guess is and it's only a guess I would guess that internationally, we're not the only country that has computers. And I'm guessing when they scan your passport on their end, that that's part of the of the the exchange of international information. So the passport probably tells the worker who's who's screening you for admission, that that you have that, that you have that conviction that they've received that notice and I bet they send you to the secondary line.

Andy 13:14

I just wonder if they just get a flag that's process, alternate processing or do they actually get something that prompt pops up, you know, naughty pictures or something that tells what what you did, just wondering, is it just a flag that says send them to the other line? Or do they have any level of detail? That's all I'm wondering,

Larry 13:30

I betting it's just a secondary screening and when you get to secondary screening, I'm betting that they have the information.

Andy 13:37

Very good. Um, I may have to track down this next thing with read letter from Ross. I don't think I've got that one pulled up. Give me one second.

Larry 13:48

I can read it. It's a short one if you like. (Andy: Go ahead.) It says:

*Listener Question*

Friends, I look forward to receive your newsletter. I'm incarcerated for 171 months for possession and sharing six photos of minors. I erased them and turned from that behavior. Weeks later, found out there was an investigation. They threatened me with six consecutive sentences which would have been life. So I took the deal in quotes and received 171 months. What I did was wrong. I stopped. I did it once I did not want to justify or minimize my actions. But in Minnesota murderers get less time, which maybe they should. I believe I should have too. Thanks for listening.

Larry 14:49

He doesn't really ask a question but I thought it would be appropriate to put it in here because we sometimes we wag our fingers and we say that we criticize states in the south like Alabama and Mississippi about their harshness. So in in fundamental fairness when this comes to my attention that a state we think is more enlightened such as Minnesota, if this is an accurate representation of what's going on in Minnesota, they have gotten some pretty harsh laws there. And I know at one time, I used to admire their corrections system because of what a low ratio of incarceration they had compared to the nation. But that's no longer the case in Minnesota. And I think that changed back when when Ventura was elected Governor, and the trends have been moving towards being more like the nation in terms of numbers, you know, their ratio of incarcerated individuals. But this is really sad. If that is a true story for six pictures that he erased and he's got 171 months, if you divide that by 12. That's quite a bit of prison time.

Andy 15:43

Yes, it is. I'm not doing that in my head Larry.

Larry 15:47

But I can tell you, it's more than 10 years, because 10 times 12 is 120. S(Andy: So 14 and a quarter.) So he, so I'm thinking that in the state of Minnesota, that if you're having budgetary problems that you might want to take a look at some of your harsh sentencing, if this is not an anomaly for some reason. If there is an anomaly, he's not going to tell us that. It could be six images of the most gross things you could ever imagine. You know, I don't I don't know what, but even that I don't think would justify that length of time in prison.

Andy 16:21

Don't they? Excuse me, don't they sometimes throw five years per image at you. If that's the case, then he actually was handled a pretty light sentence, because if he had six images, five, that's 30. So he's got half that.

Larry 16:34

That is correct. There are states where that, now my state, that's not the case. For just until a few years ago, it was only all the counts merged into one. And then the statute was changed. That was by court decision that the Supreme Court of our state said that the multiple images, that was the Olson case, and now they've got where you can get. But even this, the amount of time he's got exceeds the maximum you can get under our revised statute here. But this is when we talk about cutting funds for law enforcement. I know it drives people crazy, because I say something along this line every week. This is the reason why we

want to reduce funding for the law enforcement apparatus. If they didn't have the investigative resources at the police level, and they didn't have the prosecutorial resources, they would not be able to incarcerate him because they would have to focus the slightly reduced resource level to investigating something other than possession of images. And they would have to prioritize these. So when we talk about reducing funding, these are examples that I give you week after week of why we need to curtail some of the funding to law enforcement. That doesn't mean all the funding, it means some of the funding.

Andy 17:55

I wonder even in doing that though, Larry, the public is so up in arms over these crimes that they would prioritize these and let other crimes go.

Larry 18:05

Well, that is a good, legitimate question. And I guess it would depend on how that shakes out at the local level. If you have serious, violent crime and you want to put your detective force on sitting on a keyboard, trying to find exchanges of images and make that your highest priority. At some point, I would hope the community would say this is not where we want our law enforcement to be expended.

Andy 18:32

Yeah, I hear you. I mean, I can just see them going well, these are almost easy cases to get convictions out of I mean, hey, they're gonna throw like this guy said that they were gonna give him six consecutive sentences. Okay, so take six life sentences is that that he was threatened with right? Yeah. Oh, six consecutive...

Unknown Speaker 18:51

He doesn't say life

Andy 18:53

He does say would have been life, so he took that quote, unquote, deal, which I get, great. So then like, Well, shit, I will take whatever is better than spending the rest of my life in prison. Like, okay. It's just garbage. It's just garbage. Alright, we don't have to dwell on that. And I'm very sorry that he's spending 14 and some change years in prison, because that's just garbage. We ready to move over to this Doug section.

Larry 19:22

Oh, this is this is the main event. Did we make it to the main event in less than a half an hour?

Andy 19:28

We did it's 19 and 20 seconds.

Larry 19:31

All right. We have this fantastic event that I've put together with one of our patrons. And we don't name names. If we do, we don't name enough so they can figure out who it is. But this is this is one that's been bobbing around for I'd say a few months that I was supposed to be looking into. So finally, I've been doing some looking and so we're going to talk about it tonight.

Andy 19:58

Outstanding and I'll read this letter like the intro letter?

Larry 20:02

Yes.

Andy 20:04

Cool.

#### *Listener Question*

I am writing in regard to previous conversations my wife had with Andy, that's me, in my situation. And I spoke with attorney Colleen Kelly in Denver, and she recommended exploring deregistration in Minnesota. I was successfully discharged from probation on June 1, 2020. And here's a quick overview of my case in Colorado. In 2005, I was an adjunct instructor at the community college in Orange County, Colorado and had a consensual relationship with a 17 year old female student, which I received a deferred adjudication on felony sexual assault of a child 15 ages 15 to 17. I suppose that's what that is position of trust, and over 10 year age difference. It was five years of registration, and five years of probation. I had no criminal charges during that time. But in late 2009, my probation was revoked due to drinking, not re-offense. God I hate it like, like it's legal for adults to drink, Larry, but I understand that these are conditions but like, it's a legal thing for people to do. This triggered the felony conviction and lifetime registration, Holy crap, I was able to move back home to Minnesota by interstate compact probation transfer, where I had family support and turned my life around. I had no other probation violations, and I completed SO treatment in 2011, and successfully discharged from probation in June of this year, but still have lifetime registration due to the probation violation for drinking while on probation. In Minnesota, I do not have a tier designation. Since I was successfully discharged from probation, I would like to see if there is any possibility of for deregistration. Although I realize that is probably a slim chance, the probation violation from the deferred adjudication was for drinking and not re-offense. So, wonder if that might be considered a factor. And all of that, good grief.

You know, so we have a mutual friend here in Georgia whose son got I think, a just like a deferred sentence, but he was put on probation. And then on his anniversary with his wife, he goes and drink some Margarita goes to the polygraph test, says yes, I split a margarita with my wife, and then they locked him up for a year or two. So just providing a parallel similar story, which just sounds like complete garbage.

Larry 22:14

It does, indeed.

Andy 22:17

So this sounds similar. This is ridiculous.

Larry 22:21

So what was your question?

Andy 22:24

Well, my question it says, The neat thing about this case is that involves interstate movement, sexual offender by the interstate compact for adult offender supervision. Okay, you people wanted me to read this letter from a person who lives in Minnesota and was convicted in Colorado, I've read it and for the life of me, I can't

figure why you put this up for tonight, my reading is that he would like to get off the registry, which everyone does. What is unique about this particular situation?

Larry 22:47

Well as, as we're going to go into, it's unique in that we're going to talk about interstate movement of offenders via the interstate compact, we're going to talk about which states registration requirements control. And we're gonna talk about whether or not one state's removal impacts your life in another state. In other words, can one state remove you from another state's registration obligations? And we're gonna get to talk about the complexity of the petition for removal processes where they do have such a process. So we have a whole lot we can bundle into this. So let's go for it.

Andy 23:23

All right. All right. So he was convicted in Colorado and now lives in Minnesota. And he wants to petition for removal. Should he file the petition in Minnesota or Colorado? I know the answer Ding, ding, ding, it's going to be Minnesota.

Larry 23:37

That would be correct. He would have to file in Minnesota. But unfortunately, Minnesota does not appear to have a removal process.

Andy 23:49

That probably complicates it.

Larry 23:51

That is the complicating factor in this since I can't find that there is a process to be removed in Minnesota. So but that's where he would normally be granted relief, since that's where he lives.

Andy 24:04

And the only reason he is registered in Minnesota is because well, he moved there. And he deregistered on the way out the door of Colorado and then registered on his arrival into Minnesota. Right?

Larry 24:16

So far, so good.

Andy 24:20

And because I don't know if it's all states, but nearly all states have some kind of language that says if you were convicted of it doesn't say if you were registered, if you were convicted of a sexual offense in the other state, you have to register here. If it has, then there's the crazy language of if it is some sort of equivalent, similar whatever those terms are.

Larry 24:39

So that is correct. So I think you're trying to ask me if he is he's registering in Minnesota simply because of the Colorado conviction and there's a catch all provision in Minnesota. And yes, there Yeah, there is. There is a catch all in Minnesota. And and at the time he moved to Minnesota, it does not appear he would have had a register obligation, because the conduct is actually triggered the duty to register would not have been, I would not even even been an offence in Minnesota. Certainly, if it's not an offense, it would not have been a registerable offence because the

age of consent at a time was 16. And the college student was one of those that was just shy of being 18. And that would have been a consensual act in Minnesota.

Andy 25:26

So this is where going into that state, though, then he they should have looked at whatever the similarity is to it and let it go?

Larry 25:35

No, that's not what they... they have the catch all provision that he went on interstate compact, and even if there's not a catch all provision, if you compact into a state where you're having to register, and you try to unregister, and make a fuss about having to register the state that sent you there gave you permission is not going to be happy with you. But but most of them, most of them, I mean, think about it, if they grant you the privilege of moving and you move for the purpose of getting off the radar, they're not gonna be too happy about that. And beyond that, Minnesota had the provision that that, that if he had the register in the state of his conviction, he had to register there. So he so he had to register in Minnesota. And but had he done this exact same conduct in Minnesota, he wouldn't have had to have registered if the actual underlying offense had occurred in Minnesota at the time. Now, it appears as though I'm relying on on one of the contributors to this to do the research, it now appears that they've changed the law. And that that that is that is a crime that would put a person on the registry and in Minnesota but it wasn't at that time.

Andy 26:46

Then I just have to ask you, which one would control? Wouldn't it be the date of conviction and not the date that the law got changed? It's a civil regulatory scheme, they can do whatever they want.

Larry 26:57

You answered the question.

Andy 27:03

I, you know, when I have conversations with people about this, and I purposely get themselves, like wrapped into this whole thing, if you go like 100 miles an hour over the speed limit, they are going to arrest you. But otherwise, traffic fines are just some kind of misdemeanor thing. And you know, it is a civil regulatory scheme. But you don't normally end up going to prison for these things. And I get people wrapped up in this loop of the level of punishment that goes along with this quote, unquote, civil regulatory scheme. And I get them going well, yeah, that sounds like punishment, but it's a civil regulatory scheme. So they can just change things whenever they want. But that's after the fact, that's after the crime has occurred. Right, that they can do that, because it's a civil regulatory scheme. But it sounds like Anyway, you just go around around around, anyway.

Larry 27:46

Well, well, but it's not. It's not that complicated. They, first of all, the traffic, the traffic, largely, those are criminal citations, even though you don't get arrested, that is a criminal court. There are, there are civil traffic tickets, like the red light cameras and the speed vans and stuff. But most of the time, you're getting you're getting summoned into a criminal court. But the criminal penalties for those offenses are usually far less severe. Unless you're a

repeat... if you've run 100 miles an hour enough times they will put you in prison for that.

Andy 28:19

Yes and they will have taken your license first, though,

Larry 28:23

They will they, maybe, maybe not. But but but you. But But what you continue to confuse about the penalty for the sex offense didn't change, he still has eight to five years of whatever he got was not impacted by the civil regulatory scheme. The Civil regulatory scheme would be like if they change something related to car operation, if they change the rules related to licensure and your car operations, your registration, that doesn't, you don't get grandfathered in. If they change the safety requirements that have safety inspections that they're not gonna say, well, you got you don't have to worry about this. So as long as the registration has not been deemed punishment by the court, they can change it. now on this particular situation. I didn't have enough time in the last five months actually was like, four months. Since this question came to me. I didn't have enough time to do the research to find out when they when they made that a registerable offense in Minnesota, they had to do two things they had to they had to create the crime first, and then they put it on the list. There would be a legal argument that's the crime didn't exist at the time that you couldn't be required to register for something that didn't exist. But the bureaucracy is going to take the position without specificity in the end, how they applied it. If you look at the the applicability section of that of that statute, where they added it to the list, if they didn't say for convictions are occurring on or after this date. The bureaucracy is going to take the position that that since it is civil regulatory, they can apply to everybody that's that's going to be their position absent specific instruction from the legislature.

Andy 30:05

Okay, and I've heard you repeatedly say on this podcast, the state of residence controls registration, because you checked out from A and you've moved to B. Now I'm betting that you're going to come up with some reasons why he was forced to register in Minnesota, even though Minnesota would not have required registration. I think we already just talked about that, because they have the catch all phrase, right?

Larry 30:22

That's correct. They have, they have to catch all. But Minnesota also has, in addition to the, to the catch all they have, they have they have specific language, it looks like they don't want to be haven in any way. If you come to Minnesota, if you've made obscene phone calls in Georgia to a minor, you're gonna have to register Minnesota the way I read the law. So so they're there, they're big on making sure that that if you're registered, you're not gonna escape it there.

Andy 30:51

Can you do me a favor and give me some examples, one of them that comes to mind at something that says substantially similar, like that, that is part of the language of the catch all stuff?

Larry 31:01

In our case, it says equivalent, but in most states, it says, a reasonably or substantially similar, I think substantially is the most common is, substantially similar is the language that that leaves it wide open.

Andy 31:15

Because I was just about to ask, do you have any kind of due process for interpretation of what substantially similar or reasonably similar means?

Larry 31:21

Usually not. Usually, it's a bureaucrat, since registration is bifurcated in most of our states, meaning that the law enforcement units handle it. And then there's the central administration done by the state, the law enforcement, when you first set foot in there, they want to register all they can. So so you the deck is stacked against you, when you set foot in there, you found registered in Georgia for making obscene phone calls. That sheriff's office is not trying to cut you loose, it would be the rarest of circumstances that are trying to cut your loose. Now somebody's gonna say that a sheriff back in some County, back in 2014, said I don't want you to have to register it, there might be that anomaly. But most of the time, they're gonna want you to register, because they would rather be safe than sorry. And the way they look at it is A) it means potentially more federal funds for compliance checks. They look at going to their local funders for a sheriff usually has to appeal to their county commissioners or their county board of supervisors or whatever they call it their governing authority for funding. And if they say we've got 940 registrants at our county, and that's up by 22% over the last two years, and we've still got the same number of Deputies we had. And we need more resources. So we can keep an eye on these people. But would that if they told people we don't want you to register? Would that help them or hinder them and getting more funds?

Andy 32:52

That would definitely hinder them. And this would be where you were just talking about defunding the police? Again,

Larry 32:56

that's correct. When we talk about defunding the police. Again, we're not talking about total abolition of funding. We're talking about forcing wise choices by slightly reducing funding, the same type of thing that conservatives say that should be done with liberal programs they don't like. They talk about, sometimes outright abolition, but they talk about dramatic reductions in funding because we need to try a different approach. And that's all we're talking about is the same thing that they talked about.

Andy 33:29

Tell me about this, didn't we discuss something from one of the circuit courts that talked about registration, something that something about registration was unconstitutional. Something like on the tip of my tongue comes back to mind about that.

Larry 33:44

We did indeed, Are you thinking about the Seventh Circuit decision out of Indiana?

Andy 33:50

It was one of those numbers.

Larry 33:52

What are you talking about when you move from or state? Is that what you're talking about?

Andy 33:57

It was, wasn't it juveniles?

Larry 34:02

the one from Indiana, I don't know what you're talking about unless you can be more specific.

Andy 34:06

Okay, well, the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals,

Larry 34:08

that's the one I'm talking about. Yeah, that's that's the Indiana case where the where the people had been convicted in Indiana, and then they had left and moved back and and we covered that a few episodes back. And, and, and, yes, the Seventh Circuit which Minnesota isn't it, but, that that case was precedential for the for that circuit, and it can certainly be cited in Minnesota, I believe is an eighth that that can be cited as persuasive authority, that you can't impose a registration obligation on Minnesota on someone just because they're in Minnesota if they wouldn't have to register there, but the problem for this individual is apparently now under existing Minnesota law, there would be a registration obligation if it were applied retroactively, depending on how they constructed that. But he might have the possibility if they applied that prospectively that he might have a cause of action in the federal courts under the equal protection clause that could be modeled after what was done in Indiana.

Andy 35:21

What you what is the clearest of proof mean in this case?

Larry 35:27

It means one step below beyond a reasonable doubt.

Andy 35:31

And beyond a reasonable doubt is almost like I am just slightly shy of 100% certain, I mean, is that kind of a way to look at it?

Larry 35:38

No one knows for sure. But But we we like to think that jurors take that as a very high burden. And that's part of what I do at your at your at your board, or you try to figure out what kind of evidentiary requirements you are going to have, if you're a defense attorney. If you are the prosecution, you hope they don't have any requirements at all, you hope that they just rubber stamp, when we had Ashley on some time back, she said, everybody wants a fair jury, nobody wants a fair jury. Everybody wants a jury

Andy 36:08

I don't really give a shit. As long as I go home without having to go to prison. That's all I care about. I don't care about fair.

Larry 36:15

So when the prosecution is creating the jurors, they're looking to exclude people that that they perceive that might actually be fair to you. Which is sad, because as a prosecutor, they have an ethical obligation to seek justice. But as a defense attorney, you don't have that ethical obligation to seek justice, you have an ethical obligation to try to prevent the state from putting your client in a cage. That's the ethical obligation you have.

Andy 36:43

You're just trying to keep balls out of the net, and they're doing everything they can to put the ball in the net, all you're trying to do is keep it from going in the net, that's all.

Larry 36:51

And people mistakenly tell me all the time, we have an obligation to tell the truth. We don't we have an obligation not to lie. But we don't have an obligation to reveal the truth. You ethically, ethically cannot put your client on and let them tell a lie. That's unethical. But you do not have to have your client tell the truth. That's not our job.

Andy 37:14

Sure. and telling the truth. I don't have a very clear example in my head. But I know that pleading the fifth would be not telling the truth. You're just declining to answer. And I'm sorry, let me, you're not lying, you're not telling them, you're not giving out the information.

Larry 37:34

Right? Well, if you if you choose to testify, you can't invoke the 5<sup>th</sup>, I mean, you don't get to pick and choose what you answer. But if you if people think that when there's an accusation made, that the defense team has an obligation to help find the truth, we do not have such an obligation. The truth is not something we're searching for. We don't go into it looking for the truth. I mean, in your private conversations with your client, you try to find out what truth. We go into it hoping that we can prevent the state from convicting you so that they can put you in a cage. That's what our ethical, ethical obligation is, is to look at the state's case, and see where the holes are, and try our best to make sure that they don't win within the bounds of ethical behavior. We're not trying to, we're not trying to reveal the truth. The person that's sitting there, behind the prosecution, that's the alleged victim, we're not obligated to help them feel good and go home with justice.

Andy 38:41

You're just there working for your client to keep them from going to prison?

Larry 38:44

That is correct. There's no such obligation for us to try to reveal what happened. And too many people say how do you sleep with yourself when you could show the truth. We sleep just fine because that's not our job to to reveal the truth. That's your job,

Andy 39:01

you choose the side that you're going to be on too

Larry 39:04

You chose to bring the charges against the person, you chose to seek a termination of their freedom. It's your job to show by proof beyond a reasonable doubt that that person should be in a cage. I have no such obligation.

Andy 39:22

Is this uh, do you think this some that NARSOL would get into supporting?

Larry 39:27

It very well could be. As as an opportunity to talk about what NARSOL does, impact litigation is an example and this, I'm guessing he's not the only person who has an out of state conviction who's residing in Minnesota. And I'm guessing that that they've applied this catch all provision to all of those people regardless of what their out of state conduct has been. So this would be something that would pass the initial screening for litigation. Now, once you pass the initial screening doesn't mean you're going to get funding and support, it means that you qualify as having a case that has impact beyond you. What we would look at beyond that would be the winnability of such a case. We would look at the legal team, we would have to look at existing precedents, what what kind of cases have already been litigated regarding out of state registration and were they put together properly? Are we already screwed from the get go because of bad case law? But in terms of in terms of... I mean, you can be. You can be into something where already sloppy litigation's been done, and there's precedent that you're gonna have a hard time overcoming, because they already ruled on it, the judges can't make You have a good case, if you don't put together a good case. And if you suffer a bad really, because you put together a sloppy case, it may be that that may preclude us. But this would certainly be something that we would be interested in looking at because of the impact beyond this individual.

Andy 40:58

When you're on supervision, you can just sort of like on interstate compact, and you just get returned back home, is this the case that he could just return back to Colorado, and try to pick up where you left off with Colorado removal process?

Larry 41:14

Well, he's already off supervision, so so he won't need to even consider that. But unfortunately, going back to Colorado won't do him any good either. So it's sad, but but if he were to go back to Colorado, he has an offense because that was a position of trust, that prevents him from being considered under their deregistration process.

Andy 41:45

That's not cool, either, then does he go to Vermont? Since we always pull up Vermont.

Larry 41:51

We've got to stop doing that.

Andy 41:54

I know, they're gonna change their laws and all the Vermonters are going to be very pissed off at us.

Larry 41:59

So...

Andy 42:00

Vermontonians? What would they be called? Nevermind. Um, but you have a lot of challenges with like removal processes. And you said something about California like, yeah, they'll have a removal process. But there's no way anybody other than the the tiniest narrowest of people are going to actually get off of the California registry.

Larry 42:21

I get a lot of hate mail about those comments and people take them out context. They say that that apparently, I don't like a removal process. Actually, that's way out of context. What I don't like is there doesn't need to be a removal process. If you simply want to follow the Adam Walsh Act, the tier one and tier threes just simply timeout when you've done your requisite term queue timeout. So in California, and this beautiful system that's developed, the tier ones and tier three, tier twos have to file a petition after they've timed out. For the life of me, I cannot understand why they did that. Course I understand exactly why they did it. Because it was the only acceptable thing politically. When you start talking about changing lifetime registration. You couldn't just go from having no removal process at all to a free for all, where everybody just just turns off, and it goes and disappears, like, you know what into the wind. So politically, they couldn't do that. But, but they could have done a lot better job than what they created with all the cumbersome steps that you have to go through in that removal process in California, which makes it so unlikely that very many people will benefit from it. Is it better than not having a process? Yes.

Andy 43:45

I was just about to ask you isn't having one better than not Mr. Negative Nelly, and whatever? Nelson? Yeah, negative Nelson.

Larry 43:53

Yes, it's better than no process. If you have a lifetime obligation, like in my state, many do. And there's no process and you're on your walker and oxygen. It's better than having no process because that leaves you no hope. But I would prefer that as many people as are permissible under the federal, those rigid federal guidelines, I would prefer they just simply terminate based on the time that they've been on the registry. And then the tier threes, which there isn't a process in the federal law, they are supposed to stay on until the end of their life. I would prefer that we be creative and figure out a process that they can go through and have a real fair process for the tier threes. And and when I say tier threes, I would like for only the people who are required to be in tier three to be in tier three, which very few states, if any, have ever done it that way. But the tier threes are the only ones who should have to file a petition. Otherwise, they should just terminate and be done. And that's what I don't like about it. A lot of people don't have the 1000s of dollars to pay. And they end up falling it pro se. And they end up getting sunk pro se, because of the steps that they screw up, or the victim opposes it, and they can't have a conversation. Can you imagine what it would look like if you tried to sit down and talk with your victim? How would that go? I mean, not personally, (Andy: Either way.) So how do you feel

about me getting off the registry? How does that conversation look like?

Andy 45:39

And if you're still under supervision, you're probably prevented from having that conversation, even third party, so I can't even hire you and your legal team Larry to do this on my behalf.

Larry 45:49

Well, if you're under supervision, I can't imagine you'd be eligible for removal, would you?

Andy 45:54

No but if we were going to try and knock it all out at one time. And you would have to do all this in one shot. I was just bringing this up as an extra inhibitor that you couldn't even do it third person. Can I wink wink, nod nod hire you to do this on my behalf without me asking you to do me this favor?

Larry 46:11

Well, maybe.

Andy 46:14

We just can't talk about and have any sort of documentation that says that this happened. All right, well, what's wrong with the Colorado process? Why won't, why won't this person be able to get off the registry in Colorado?

Larry 46:24

Well, first, he's not in Colorado, and he has no plans to live there. So as we said before Colorado cannot terminate another state's registration obligations. And second, even if he did reside in Colorado, as I said earlier, his conviction isn't eligible because of the exceptions. And, and that really, that really bugs me that they have so many exceptions. In Colorado, for example, if a person has been convicted of more than one count, even within the same case number, they're not eligible in Colorado, and we had that talked about by Colleen Kelly, who is an attorney who practices in Metro Denver. And that that is such I mean, you could have had multiple escapades with a consensual partner, that simply the age alone made that made that illegal and unlawful sexual activity, and you can't be removed, yet you have children because you got married to that person, and you're on the registry for life, and you're not eligible. I mean, isn't that a beautiful system?

Andy 47:26

It's amazing. That one, yeah, I mean, even in my supervision, stuff, I know, it's not registry related. But my supervision stuff is that I couldn't have contact with my own children, child, he, excuse me. Yeah, with anyone under the 18, including my own child, that was like one of the probation restrictions, which is unbelievable to me. I could understand if that were the victim, I would totally understand that. But not if it's not.

Larry 47:48

So this, this man, has his lifetime earnings adversely impacted, which I don't think is good for us. I mean, we all have our paws out wanting some of that income transfer. And he would be able to put a lot more in the kitty for us to transfer and have transferred to us if he were allowed to maximize his potential. So that's not in the best interest of society, and just the calendar by a few months

created this situation of a consensual affair. And some I mean, I've heard, I've talked to people who teach that various levels of educational particularly even in universities, and I've heard that sometimes they like the instructors. And I've heard that, but I would much prefer that, that that he be allowed to be fully employed, paying his taxes, and being a responsible citizen, rather than being saddled with this one mistake that he made a long time ago, for the rest of his life.

Andy 48:47

Totally. Yeah, I can't quite wrap my head around that whole side of things. And so we've been doing this for almost 30 minutes and what is it you don't like about the Colorado removal process itself?

Larry 49:03

It's just it's just too, too cumbersome. It's similar to California. And you remember the *Millard v. Rankin* case with judge Matsch decided in favor? that was one of the plaintiffs issue that he had filed petitions, I think, one or maybe two. I think it was more than one as a matter of fact, a judge made a notice in the decision of how that no matter what he did, it wasn't good enough. It was like a moving goalpost to be to be removed. So I put the removal process in for the patrons that people who want to look at it, it's Colorado Revised Statutes 16-22-113 and it's like seven pages of stuff and it tells you all the hoops you have to jump through and what shall happen in terms of the victim involvement and everything. And I just, I can't wrap my brain around something that that complicated. All it all it does is make you make a lot of money for lawyers it sure does do that.

Andy 50:00

You people can't wrap your head around it? We lay people are doomed.

Larry 50:03

So well, if I studied it long enough, I could wrap my brain around it, but it is not necessary. It's not written in a way that would achieve the goal. The goal should be, in my view, to deregister rehabilitated people. I mean, I wish there were no registration to begin with. But at the point this person has been rehabilitated, there should be a legitimate process that would let them get off the registry. And they made it where virtually no one gets off. I'd like to know the stance, I'd like to ask Colleen, how many of your petitions are actually granted?

Andy 50:38

Sure. And back to your notion of this level ones, possibly level twos would just timeout after X number of years post their sentence ends. Is that where you would go, where you would go with that possibility? Like ones as soon as your your sentence ends? Maybe twos, like five or 10 years later? Is that something along the lines that you're thinking of?

Larry 50:56

Well, I was just talking about in terms of the Adam Walsh Act itself, if you want to be federally compliant, which not all states have expressed that desire. California has in fact, rejected AWA compliance. So since you don't even have that in the back of your mind, why would you want to have a standard more extreme than those harsh federal standards which you have rejected as being unsound? Could it be that actually you want to be tougher than

the federal law? Because what California is requiring to get off the registry is not required by the Adam Walsh Act, you do not have to file a petition.

Andy 51:38

Anything else? I'm out of ideas for questions. Is there anything else you want to talk about this before we move on?

Larry 51:44

I think we spent enough time on it. I hope that helps our listeners.

Andy 51:50

Ready to be a part of Registry Matters? Get links at [registrymatters.co](http://registrymatters.co). If you need to be discreet about it, contact them by email [registrymatterscast@gmail.com](mailto:registrymatterscast@gmail.com). You can call or text a ransom message to (747)227-4477. Want to support Registry Matters on a monthly basis? Head to [patreon.com/registrymatters](https://patreon.com/registrymatters). Not ready to become a patron? Give a five-star review at Apple podcasts or Stitcher or tell your buddies that your treatment class about the podcast. We want to send out a big heartfelt support for those on the registry. Keep fighting. Without you, we can't succeed. You make it possible. Before we do like I guess not quite revisionist history but back to the future. We will we'll go back over to House Bill 56 from New Mexico. And I really want to like know from you, Larry, what you're actually trying to do in this case? Like what is your like the fundamental goal of what you're trying to do? \*Plays audio clip\* Forgive the audio quality. It's a 700-year-old audio clip and who is that?

Larry 53:18

That would be the late legendary University of Alabama football coach Paul Bear Bryant, who was trying to give an interview in a very loud environment. And he was being questioned about why he made a quarterback change at halftime, and her very succinctly says I'm trying to win the game. That's my strategy.

Andy 53:41

Okay, and so why would you employ this strategy or that strategy? Why would you do these things?

Larry 53:48

Well, I just got through telling you, but coach Bryant told you, we're trying to win the game.

Andy 53:54

Alright, so this segments over?

Larry 53:58

Well, not completely over.

Andy 54:03

But I mean, to rehash all of this stuff, though, is that you want you people, you want your people in New Mexico to simply trust that what you are doing that they should just trust? Is that to sum it all up?

Larry 54:24

Well, sort of Yes. That that's kind of what you have to do. If you if you can't do this yourself. And most people either do not possess the skills or the time, then that's kind of what I'm asking us to take a look at our record, which is an exemplary one. And give faith

that we have an idea of what we're doing. And we do have, we do have a strategy. We have we have the basic strategy of trying to win the game. Which means that we do not want House Bill 56 to pass. So that's the strategy. We want House Bill 56 to die. So what more about my strategy do you want to know?

Andy 55:16

I want to know the ins and outs, I want to know who you're going to go talk to, I know what you want to I want to know what you're going to talk about. I want to know all of those things.

Larry 55:25

Well, but that that's difficult to tell you, I mean, we'll go back to the sports analogy. What I don't know what sports you follow, but footballs what we're talking about with coach Bryant, what team puts their game plan out to the public before the game is played, I mean, I mean, basically, they tell you we're trying to win the game. And our strategy is to score more points than the opposing team but in terms of what exactly who I'm going to talk to and what I'm going to do, to go and put the exact plan on the table would render that plan, less likely to succeed. But there, there is a plan. And the plan, just as in football or any sport is subject to change according to how the game is unfolding. And this is a game. We're on defense. The state has proposed through a legislator, a public policy, a dramatic public policy change that we do not agree with. So they're the offensive unit. They're trying to move their goal forward. And we're the defensive unit. And we're trying to prevent their goal from moving forward. And we will have to adjust as as a sports team would have to do depending on what type of type of traction they get, and how quickly they start moving towards accomplishing their goal. Now in this particular case, they've already moved it past the first committee. It was assigned since it's a house bill, it was assigned to two committees in the house, the house Consumer and Public Affairs Committee. And then the second committee is the Judiciary Committee. The Consumer and Public Affairs Committee is a five-member committee. And since the democrats hold the majority in the state, it's a 3:2 ratio as we've talked about, and the chair is the sponsor of one of the sponsors. And the the other primary sponsor is, so it's Liz Thompson and Georgine Lewis. Georgine's running for Congress right now, because we have an open seat with with Deb Holland being appointed to be Interior Secretary. So we're going to have that seat, that congressional seat open. You think that since Georgina, is running for that seat to be the Democratic nominee, do you think she would be likely to be amenable to our overtures to try to pull back on this particular legislation? Do you think that that would be at her political interest right now, if we if we spent a lot of time on Georgine?

Andy 57:53

Probably not.

Larry 57:55

Do you think that we could since they that chair, the committee, is the sponsor, as well as the two primary sponsors? Do you think that she's in a mood to kill her own legislation? (Andy: Probably not either.) Okay, well, then, then you've got one other Democrat, which has become a benefactor, so I won't name them. And then you've got two republicans. Do you think that the republicans are interested in killing registration? So you've got you've got, you've got nothing to work with in consumer public affairs. So the

strategy was to allow those who want to try to influence that committee that don't realize that they can't have much impact on that committee to let them go ahead and expend their energy. And, and, and our strategy was to do a more surgical approach. And to look at the next step, which is the Judiciary Committee, which is where the bill has now been assigned to. And we're gonna focus more energy now that it's in Judiciary. That's still not the end of the line, because it has a lot of territory, it has to pass House Judiciary, it has to go the floor and be given final approval. It has to be introduced in the Senate, it has to go through a committee process in the Senate. So we've got several options along the way to try to deal with this. But it was not amended in Consumer and Public Affairs. So it passed as it was introduced. At this point, we have to decide if we want to try to amend it, or if we want to continue trying to kill it. I haven't made that decision yet. In terms of in terms of what the strategy is going to be now that it is in judiciary. I would announce it if I had, but I have not made that decision yet. In terms of what I'm going to do. I'm going to try to pull some people in the judiciary figure out what the sentiment is whether that committee and what what what type of mood there in terms of this particular subject. Once I do that, I'll figure out what what what to do next. But truly, you don't know what you're going to do until the game is unfolding, you can have the greatest game plan in football, you can plan to run a passing game. And it may be that the defense so understands your offensive unit that they break up every pass play, and you may have to go to a ground game. So we don't know exactly what we're going to do, what we do know is that we're gonna try to kill it. And if we can't kill it, we're gonna try to amend it where it'll be less disastrous. That's the strategy. And I don't know how much simpler I can make it.

Andy 1:00:27

It's funny, there's a there's a clip from the famous boxer Mike Tyson that says, everyone has a plan going into the game until they get punched in the mouth. I don't know the exact wording, but it's something to that effect. Everything would just be malleable. You could have plan A,B,C,D Oh, crap, we need a plan E all of a sudden, and I you know, like our military and our, our, our leaders like that they will make you know, how many different contingency plans? Well, let's make one for everything. And that would go to Donald Rumsfeld and the unknown unknowns? How would you know, how would you know how to plan for something you don't know is coming?

Larry 1:01:00

Well, here, I mean, I can give you little clues. If you listen. I don't believe that we will be able to successfully kill it at the house. And that's for a number of reasons. And and some of them I won't say publicly, but one I will say publicly as that the house has to face the electorate every two years which mate makes the angry mob more of a threat to them. Senators only have to face the angry mob every four years, and they just got through facing the angry mob in November. So the senate can be more deliberative and thoughtful. The house since this is a house bill, that they've got the first crack at it. And they are more likely to succumb to all of the pressure that's being put on them because they're going to be facing the voters a lot sooner than the senators. So that gives you a strategic advantage. Same thing in the US Senate. Do you think that the US Senate and I'm not trying to politicize the stimulus, but do you think that the US Senate now that they've just had the election, and they they they blocked stimulus before the election?

Do you think that now that they're gonna magically since those people that that blocked it have six years before they have to face the mob again, do you think they're magically going to have a change of heart and all of a sudden be in favor of stimulus? Of course not. Because in six years there's no telling where the economy will be? There could be a labor shortage and everybody could have become super wealthy? I mean, we know we don't know. So they're not thinking about that? Well, the Senate in our state will be the deliberative body, that will be where we will focus more of our energy, because they have the luxury of being insulated more from from the angry voters.

Andy 1:02:49

Isn't there? They call it crossover day in Georgia, do you have something? Is there a term equivalent? Or is that a standard term where the bills move from one side of the chamber to the other,

Larry 1:02:58

We do not have that here, it can cross over in the final few days. Now, the later crosses over bad things happen, potentially happen, because if a bill that has widespread support, doesn't cross over until the final week of the session, it's more likely that it's going to be rushed along in the Senate. So they might may only give it one committee assignments, but because two committee assignments for the week left would be death. And then like we had, we have one of our patrons who said, well, they do things in the middle night. They sure do. They do things the middle night, because of the final week, they have to start working long hours to try to clear the backlog of bills that have crossed over to the respective other side you have depending on which one it was House or Senate Bill, those bills are all sudden piling up on the other side. And also they're doing a lot of floor debating on on bills that have that have been finalized. And that are on final passage, I should say. And they're having to have their floor debates, which are causing the floor sessions to go later. So they end up having longer and later committee meetings into the evening hours. And then if they adopted the three-day notice requirement that people say, well, they should be a three day notice before there's a hearing on a bill. Well, if they did that, things that crossed over in the final week, there would not be enough time to give notice and have the hearing. So that's that's the reason why they post the agendas online and on the doors and as time really gets short, sometimes onlinedoesn't even keep up. It's just on the doors on the committee room hearing doors. If you don't have anyone in the capital, or if you don't have anyone who has a relationship with the committee Secretaries, then you don't even know what's on the agenda because things are just moving too fast. But it's not anything sinister. They didn't plot to do that. We're gonna do this and rush this through in the middle of night when when the lights are out and nobody will know. It's because that's just the system we have.

Andy 1:05:00

I think that we should continue doing these legislative discussions. And I know that they are like super wiedzny and probably people their eyes start rolling the back of their heads. But wouldn't it be possible to get someone even if we like covered their voice, do you think it would be possible to get some politician on here to bat things around? And I don't have a subject in mind. But do you maybe even a lobbyist that would like really, you know, that you

can noodle around back and forth on these topics and conversations?

Larry 1:05:29

I think it'd be possible we've had in NARSOL, we've had, we've had senators and elected people speak, I think we had an Ohio, we had in New Mexico, which you weren't around then, but we've that before.

Andy 1:05:42

okay, I think that would be kind of neat to somebody on your level, because I'm, you know, I'm like still learning how to crawl, and you're, you're running marathons?

Larry 1:05:50

Well, I wouldn't say that.

Andy 1:05:55

I think it would be something good for us to continue to bring it out very regularly, to continue talking about this legislative process, but you know, in whatever, two ish months from now, all this stuff, all the things shut down, and then we don't talk about it again, I know that they're a year round legislators, but they're, for the most part, everybody shuts down for another 10 months.

Larry 1:06:13

Well, it varies some go all the way till April, May and June. But by and large, our states are part time legislative bodies. And they, if you get to June, there's very few in session at that point.

Andy 1:06:28

And to backtrack on one other little piece of that they're not paid or a small amount of money, like just some kind of per diem money, parking money, some grocery money.

Larry 1:06:36

Well, depends on the state. Some states pay a decent salary. ours, ours doesn't. I think in Maryland, they pay like 50,000 a year. Here, they get a per diem around \$194 a day when they're in session.

Andy 1:06:47

And that's only for 60 days?

Larry 1:06:50

yeah, well, it's 60 days this year, it's 30 days in the even number of years. But if anybody's ever visited, Santa Fe, tell me when you rent a hotel room in Santa Fe, and you pay for food, what do you have left of \$194.

Andy 1:07:07

Probably \$100.

Larry 1:07:11

Probably not.

Andy 1:07:14

You should set up an Airbnb then Larry, you'd make a fortune.

Larry 1:07:19

They do a lot of them stay and but but the the reality is \$194 barely covers their existing expenses when they're in the capital. A

few of the legislators that represent Santa Fe, and they can live in their houses, they still get the \$194 that they do all right, don't they, comparatively?

Andy 1:07:42

Yeah, yeah, sure. Sure. Sure. Sure. Totally. Yeah, in New Mexico is a pretty big state, Maryland, on the other hand, other than if you lived over on the super West Side, trying to go over to Annapolis, you, you probably could commute almost every day from just about anywhere in the state.

Larry 1:07:58

I don't know I think I think we'd have someone disagree on that. If you talked about the traffic that if you depending on where you are in Maryland, there's some hellaciously bad traffic.

Andy 1:08:08

So there is traffic, certainly in the spaghetti junction, spaghetti zone, I forget what it's called at this point. I used to live there a long, long, long time ago. I don't know that we have anything else Larry. Do we have anything else that do you want to hit any of these articles, we were a little over an hour, we're almost at an hour and 10 minutes. Do you want to cover anything else?

Larry 1:08:30

I think we should just shut this down and tell people that if you want a transcript, that service is booming. And so if you want to have a transcript, you can become a patron at 15 a month, or we actually do the transcripts directly. But that cuts you out the loop. The person can actually subscribe with us directly for transcripts, and and the list is growing.

Andy 1:08:58

Outstanding. What do people do if they're not receiving it? Do they just do they torch your building? I get reports from people every now and then that they're not receiving the transcript.

Larry 1:09:10

Well, I don't get those reports. Do they get forwarded to us? We correct it every time we hear about a missing transcript.

Andy 1:09:17

I know I was just I'm just bringing it up. So if because it happened again, and I need to get that data to you. I do want to highlight one little thing that I came across there is a YouTube channel from one of our people one of our people, we people the you people, one of we us people and it is The Outspoken Offender. I don't know I think I brought up a video of his maybe a month or so ago that the guy was calling around and recording the phone calls with various different apartment complexes. And he's got another one out there and I even want to like kind of it kind of goes back to the Colorado thing but his lease is up here in a couple weeks months and he's talking about he likes where he lives but he's got to be I think on the registry for life and he is thinking about moving back to his state of origin which I think is Utah, which does have a removal process. Anyway, I just wanted to highlight because he's one of us, we you people and go out there and say hi to the outspoken offender.

Larry 1:10:11

So the outspoken offender, I'll remember that.

