



2021 March 24

Thank you, Madame Chair, and thank you members of the committee.

My name is Brittany Vessely and I am the Executive Director of the Colorado Catholic Conference (CCC), which is the united voice of the four Catholic bishops of Colorado in public policy. I speak on behalf of the conference this afternoon to testify **in opposition** to SB 16.

SB 16 removes the requirement that “family planning services” be provided by a **certified** family planning clinic. The terms “family planning services” and “family-planning-related services” are not clearly defined in the bill and **could include abortions**.

Furthermore, this bill removes the requirement that a provider obtain parental consent before providing family planning services to a minor. **This means that if SB 16 is enacted, pregnant minors could potentially abort their child without parental consent at a “family planning” clinic that may not be certified with a licensed physician on staff.**

Colorado health insurance carriers already cover contraception and family planning services, as required under federal law – *but federal law does not include abortion*. Because SB 16 **does not** use identical language as the federal law that it seeks to codify into Colorado law, it could be interpreted to have a different scope than existing federal law.

Additionally, the Biden administration has recently proposed executive action to allow Title X family planning clinics to provide referrals to abortion providers. If the administration takes this action, the scope of family planning services included under SB 16 would likely be interpreted to include such abortion referrals.

The Catholic Church teaches, and human reason based on the findings of science affirms, that human life begins at conception. The Church objects to abortion on the moral principle that each and every human life has inherent dignity, and thus must be treated with the respect due to a human person. This is the foundation of the Church’s social doctrine. There has never been or will be a legitimate need to abort a baby in the womb.

The Church also teaches that sex belongs only in marriage, and there is a symbolic bodily unity of man and wife in marital intercourse. Therefore, every form of contraception is an active effort to destroy the procreative potential of an act that is a sign of married love. This makes contraception as outlined in this bill a violation of the sanctity of life.

We respectfully ask for a “no” vote on SB 16. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Brittany Vessely
 Executive Director, Colorado Catholic Conference

The website was not allowing me to submit my written testimony opposing SB016. Please accept the statement below.

I oppose SB016 because it completely disregards parental choices and consent when it comes to a medical decision for a minor child. All medical decisions (vaccines included) should be made in the privacy of a doctor's office with the consent and agreement of both parents and the complete knowledge and understanding of risks and benefits of that medical decision. It is very well known that a child's brain has not completely development until usually age 20 or even closer to age 25 for boys. Why would you think that a child under the age of 18 can understand fully and consent to the potential risks that come along with vaccination? My 13 year old cannot even remember where they left their phone or find their shoes in the morning before school. Yet it is somehow okay for them to make a very serious medical decision for themselves without a parent? That is utterly ridiculous and downright dangerous. Not to mention this breeds an attitude of distrust and dishonesty in our children.

How can a parent know to look out for any adverse reactions or help their child if the parent and the child's personal doctor are unaware that they were even given a vaccine? This has so many horrible implications, I cannot even begin to list them all.

If a child turns 18 and decides that they wish to go and receive every vaccine that their parent perhaps was hesitant about, that is absolutely their decision. But, until the age of 18, a parent must be part of this decision making. I am completely flabbergasted that a bill like this would ever be brought forth. Does a parent have no say over what can or cannot be done medically to their own child? I believe we are supposed to be the land of the free, but this certainly does not sound like freedom to me.

Minor children would not know that by asking for a diagnostic examination for a sexually transmitted infection that they are effectively agreeing to preventative treatment including receiving a vaccine as mandated by the state.

States have the right to restrict minors from making major decisions without parental consent because minors lack the ability and experience to make informed and mature choices.

The Supreme Court stated, "[T]he Court has held that the States validly may limit the freedom of children to choose for themselves in the making of important, affirmative choices with potentially serious consequences. These rulings have been grounded in the recognition that, during the formative years of childhood and adolescence, minors often lack the experience, perspective, and judgment to recognize and avoid choices that could be detrimental to them. *Ginsberg v. New York*, 390 U.S. 629 (1968), illustrates well the Court's concern over the inability of children to make mature choices, as the First Amendment rights involved are clear examples of constitutionally protected freedoms of choice."

Not Necessary

Health insurance plans are already required to cover vaccines including HPV and Hepatitis B Vaccines for children without copays and deductibles as required by the ACA (Affordable Care Act), § 2590.715-2713(a)(ii) - Coverage of preventive health services.

Jeopardizes Federal Funding for SBHC

ACA provides grants to School Based Health Centers (SBHC) under Section 42 USC 280h-5. (a)(3)(b) and clearly states parental consent is required for services provided to those children and adolescents in these centers. Providing services, including vaccines, to minors without parental consent at SBHCs could jeopardize federal funding.
Allows Minors to be Vaccinated at School Clinics without Parental Knowledge or Consent

According the Colorado Health Institute in 2015, roughly 35,000 Colorado children received primary and preventive health care services in SBHC. If SB016 is passed those preventive services for STIs, including vaccines, can be administered at SBHC without parental consent or knowledge.

Sincerely,

Bethany Farmer

Bethany Farmer
720.254.0261
Bethanyirenefarmer@gmail.com
3365 W. 55th Ave.
Denver 80221

Senate Health & Human Services

Wednesday, March 24, 2021

Testimony - SB21-016 Protecting Preventive Health Care Coverage

Cynthia

Glass

Against

Self

Submitted text

Witness Signup List

Karol

Christie

Amend

Self

Submitted text

Witness Signup List

| | | | | |
|---------|----------|---------|------|----------------|
| Jami | Qussar | Against | Self | Submitted text |
| Carl | Warzybok | Against | Self | Submitted text |
| Ranae | Beard | Against | Self | Submitted text |
| Heather | Muller | Against | Self | Submitted text |
| Allison | McKean | Against | Self | Submitted text |

Witness Signup List

Cristine Pitzer Against Self Submitted text

Gabrielle Palmer Against Self Submitted text
Mary Harrow Against Self Submitted text
Peggy Nang Against Self Submitted text

Jody Nickerson Against Self Submitted text

Witness Signup List

I am in **OPPOSITION** to SB21-016, which allows minors to be vaccinated with HPV and Hepatitis B vaccines and all future STD vaccines without parental knowledge or consent.

As a concerned Colorado citizen, below are several reasons for my position.

It is a violation of Federal laws.

The 1986 National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act (42 U.S.C. §300aa-26) and The Affordable Care Act under Section 42 USC 280h-5. (a)(3)(b).

It disregards a previous Supreme Court decision.

The Supreme Court stated, “[T]he Court has held that the States validly may limit the freedom of children to choose for themselves in the making of important, affirmative choices with potentially serious consequences. These rulings have been grounded in the recognition that, during the formative years of childhood and adolescence, minors often lack the experience, perspective, and judgment to recognize and avoid choices that could be detrimental to them. *Ginsberg v. New York*, 390 U.S. 629 (1968), illustrates well the Court's concern over the inability of children to make mature choices, as the First Amendment rights involved are clear examples of constitutionally protected freedoms of choice.”

It blatantly violates parental rights.

When a parent doesn't know their child has been vaccinated and that child suffers a vaccine adverse reaction, it wastes precious time for a parent to understand what has happened to their child and to seek ANY compensation by filing a case through the Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, which only has a three-year statute of limitations.

Serious questions on HPV vaccine efficacy, necessity and safety remain.

HPV vaccines have not been proven to prevent cancer of any kind and no participants in the original HPV clinical trials received true saline placebos. The clinical trials never investigated the vaccine's possible effects on human fertility or potential to cause cancer. However, 64,473 vaccine reaction reports have been made to the federal Vaccine Adverse Events Reporting System (VAERS) associated with HPV vaccines alone.

It is simply not necessary.

Witness Signup List

HONORABLE COLORADO SENATORS,

As a Colorado resident, I am urging that S.B. 21-016 be amended to remove Section 2, which allows minors to consent to vaccines for sexually transmitted diseases without parental notification.

The U.S. Supreme Court has recognized that vaccines are pharmaceutical products that carry risk of injury or death. It is irresponsible to allow children to make medical decisions that may injure or kill them without the knowledge of their parents.

The U.S. Federal Vaccine Injury Compensation Program has awarded over 4.4 billion dollars to vaccine victims. And the true numbers of injuries are undoubtedly much higher, since it is estimated that two out of three plaintiffs are turned away and the FDA says less than 1 percent of all vaccine injuries are ever reported in the first place.

Vaccines are pharmaceutical products that do carry a risk of injury or death. Minor children may not be aware of family and their own personal history of vaccine reactions or personal contraindications to relay to the vaccine administrator. My child doesn't understand her own history of vaccine reactions—and I'm guessing many other children don't either.

The U.S. Supreme Court recognizes vaccines to be "unavoidably unsafe" and to cause injury and death in some recipients. The US Government has paid out more than \$4.4 billion to the victims of vaccine injury. Hundreds of thousands have reported an adverse reaction to vaccination to VAERS.
<http://www.cdc.gov/vaccinesafety/ensuringsafety/monitoring/vaers/>

The above reasons cause me considerable hesitation in allowing minor children to be able to consent to vaccines for STDs without parental consent. Please amend Section 2 of S.B. 21-016.

Respectfully submitted,

Witness Signup List

I am urging you to oppose SB21-010, Protecting Preventive Health Care Coverage. Portions of this bill pose a threat to the minors of Colorado.

Current Colorado law allows a health care provider or facility to perform a diagnostic examination and treat a minor for an STI, discuss prevention, and include appropriate therapies and prescriptions. SB20-016 would expand provider's reach by allowing them to also administer, dispense, or prescribe preventive measures or medications...without parental consent. Vaccines are considered preventive care, so this bill would change the law to allow minors, as young as 9 years old, to be vaccinated without parental knowledge/consent, putting them at risk.

Parental consent or knowledge would not be required when a minor child is administered the HPV vaccine, the Hepatitis B vaccine or any future vaccine for a sexually transmitted disease.

This is a concern because a minor child could have a serious and even life-threatening reaction to one of these vaccines without the parent ever knowing a vaccine had been given. This may place children in danger and may prevent them from receiving appropriate medical care in response to a vaccine reaction.

In addition, a child might have little or no knowledge of allergies to vaccine ingredients or past vaccine reactions that they may have had. This also may create medical danger to minors. Allowing them to consent to a vaccine without parental knowledge or awareness is irresponsible and misguided (it's also illegal according to federal law).

This bill also creates circumstances where minors may be vulnerable to exploitation at the hands of health care providers who may not see each child as the unique individual that they are but instead may sacrifice them (perhaps unknowingly) "for the greater good." In contrast, parents, with few exceptions, are most likely to do what is best for their child medically. Parents are children's best guardians. They need to be a part of the medical decisions made for their children, particularly when those medical decisions, like the administration of vaccines, is NOT a cookie cutter, one size fits all decision but one that carries inherent risks and dangers. Special needs children or children with IEPs are at even greater risk of exploitation due to the conditions created by this legislation.

I am a very concerned parent of two children and am extremely aware of the harm that is done in Colorado when healthcare providers can diagnose and treat minors and discuss preventive measures, but what I am understanding from this bill is that it gives permission to healthcare providers to administer preventive measures without the consent of the parent and I strongly oppose this bill and I ask you to please do the same. This bill is unconstitutional and is a direct violation of individual rights as well as violates the rights of the parent. Minors are the jurisdiction of the parent and the government should be creating laws that protect minors. Allowing healthcare providers to administer preventive treatments without the consent of the parent is not protection its a violation to the parents. Healthcare providers can not assume the roll of the parent to make decisions in place of the parent. Healthcare providers do not know what is in the best interest for the minor and therefore the parents should be involved in decisions that directly impact their children. Preventive measures include vaccines and vaccines are a medical intervention that can cause injury or even death that are governed by specific federal laws. A minor is not well enough informed and educated on the seriousness of a vaccine. That's the reason why parents have consent and authorization to make decisions that a Please vote NO on this bill. Anyone with a child should understand why this is a bad idea. What if something were to happen-my child were to have a bad reaction and I dor shown to be effective in preventing cervical cancer or any cancer. In the study concerning HPV, no participant received a true saline solution placebo. There are 200 types of HPV and 99.9 percent of them resolve on their own. If a parent wants their child to be vaccinated, then they will be. This should not be done behind parents backs, especially when fear is used as a motivator.

If a child had an adverse effect from the vaccine, the parents would not know nor would they be able to sue as these manufactures are not held reliable when vaccine

Witness Signup List

The exclusion of parents proposed in SB 21 016 is of no benefit and presents significant harm. I am adamantly opposed to this bill and ask you to stop it immediately.

Let me be absolutely clear: it is never okay to go behind a parent's back and interfere in their child's medical care without their knowledge. Children are precious, vulnerable, and trusting individuals who may easily be manipulated by people who, by design or ignorance, could cause them harm. They do not have the developmental capacity to understand the potentially life-altering consequences of receiving HPV and/or Hepatitis B vaccinations, for which many serious questions remain about safety, necessity, and effectiveness. Parents are the natural and rightful protectors of their own children; parents are the ones who know their children best, including their medical history, risks, and needs, and parents must be involved in medical decisions for their children.

I stand in strong opposition to SB016. The bill requires health care providers to provide preventative care, including vaccines, to minor children who request diagnostic exams for STIs. This is a problem for a number of reasons.

First, if my 9 year old is requesting preventative care for an STI, I have a right to know so that I can protect her. Preventative care isn't just medical care - it's also getting my child away from a potential abuser.

Second, 9 year olds would eat Snickers bars for breakfast, lunch and dinner. If a doctor tells them they need a vaccine to prevent cancer, they will likely say yes, even if they don't fully understand the potential consequences.

When I say consequences, I mean consequences. For example, there are more than 64,000 adverse events associated with the HPV vaccine, and a Harvard study suggests that less than 1% of vaccine injuries are reported. A child has no business making a decision about a medical procedure that carries that kind of risk.

I love my daughter more than you do. You have no right to interfere with that relationship or my ability and desire to protect her.

I oppose this bill because it removes parental rights. Minors do not know their medical histories -ie drug allergies; nor are they competent to make medical decisions. This is No one except the child's immediate caregiver should address such issues with their children. I do not consent to any treatment not authorized by the parents of that child. The bill is written with a section that takes away the parental rights and responsibility for the care and concern of their child. In what way would this be right? A medical treatment can be administered without consent? I really don't think any child under the age of 18 should be able to make any decision without parental consent, nor the fact of the financial responsibility of the parent. If you are not consulting them and they are the ones with the insurance who is going to authorize that bill? Yes, there are exceptions as with everything as may be in an Urgent Emergency Care life threatening situation. This bill is not clear and must be very defined with that regard. This is too important to leave any room for deviation or misrepresentation or misunderstanding. Will that be another burden on the taxpayers for the poor discretion of this bill? When will this stop? The parents are the only ones that can give authorization for their insurance to pay for such services. You now have opened pandoras box of problems in regards to the insurance industry and the draining of the hospital billing department, let alone opening up legal disputes that are unnecessary and costly.

Witness Signup List

3/18/2021 20:00

Witness Signup List

3/23/2021 20:43

Witness Signup List

3/23/2021 22:19

3/23/2021 22:36

3/24/2021 13:55

3/24/2021 14:05

3/24/2021 14:21

Witness Signup List

3/24/2021 16:59

3/24/2021 18:12

3/24/2021 8:19

3/24/2021 10:45

3/24/2021 12:27

Colorado Chapter

American Academy of Pediatrics

DEDICATED TO THE HEALTH OF ALL CHILDREN®



Statement in Support of SB21-016: Protecting Preventive Health Care Coverage

On behalf of our nearly 800 members, the American Academy of Pediatrics, Colorado Chapter, writes in support of SB21-016.

As pediatricians and pediatric professionals, we know that access to contraception and screening for sexually transmitted infections (STIs) is key to supporting healthy adolescents, adults, and families. SB21-016 would help reduce unexpected billing that can occur when seeking comprehensive sexual health care, which can significantly impede access to care.

Currently in Colorado, patients can receive unexpected bills when undergoing comprehensive sexual health care. While patients have choice in family planning providers under Medicaid and Medicaid MCOs, states must determine which extended services, such as STI testing, are covered. Specifically, STI screening and treatment and family planning services are not always covered, and patients can receive a cost-sharing fee. This bill would clearly establish coverage for STI testing and treatment and close gaps in family planning coverage, improving the health of Coloradan adults and children.

STI rates are increasing in the United States. CDPHE reports a steady increase in the number of STIs diagnosed in the state with the highest figures ever recorded for gonorrhea, chlamydia, and syphilis in 2018.⁴ STIs pose a risk not only to individuals with the infections, but to babies born to infected mothers. Congenital HIV results in lifelong health consequences and congenital syphilis can cause deaths in neonates. Chlamydia and gonorrhea can cause severe systemic infections when acquired at birth.

Access to sexual health care and counseling is important for all adolescents. The American Academy of Pediatrics believes in policies supporting comprehensive sexual health care for teens, in a way that respects their consent to treatment and confidentiality.¹ The United States continues to have the highest adolescent pregnancy and birth rates among developed countries with available data (57 per 1,000 15- to 19-year-olds).^{2,3} Furthermore, the CDC estimates that individuals 15-24 years old acquire half of all new cases of STIs.⁴ Therefore, providing comprehensive sexual health information and access to contraception to all adolescents is vital.^{1,2}

In addition to caring for adolescents, pediatricians and pediatric professionals feel strongly about access to contraceptive care for adults. Unintended pregnancies are linked with higher rates of pre- and postnatal complications for the mother and child.⁵ Some complications include higher rates of preterm delivery, higher rates of low birth weight babies, higher rates of maternal postpartum depression after delivery, and poor mental and physical functioning of the infant in early childhood.⁵ These complications can impact the health of the baby, mother and other children in the home.

SB21-016 will improve access to contraceptive care and STI screening to Coloradans by reducing unexpected fees. In doing so, more adolescents and adults in Colorado will have access to vital, comprehensive, sexual health care, thus improving the health of our communities.

Sources:

¹ The American Academy of Pediatrics, Committee on Adolescence. "Contraception for Adolescents." *Pediatrics*. October 2014, 134 (4) e1244-e1256; DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2014-2299>

² The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, Committee on Adolescent Health Care. "Adolescent Pregnancy, Contraception, and Sexual Activity." Committee Opinion, No. 699. May 2017. Available at <https://www.acog.org/clinical/clinical-guidance/committee-opinion/articles/2017/05/adolescent-pregnancy-contraception-and-sexual-activity>

³ G Sedgh, LB Finer, A Bankole, MA Eilers, S Singh. "Adolescent pregnancy, birth, and abortion rates across countries: levels and recent trends." *Journal of Adolescent Health*. February 2015. 56(2) 223-230 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2014.09.007>

⁴ Colorado 2018 Sexually Transmitted Infections Annual Report. Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment, Denver, CO. February 2020.

⁵ The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, Committee on Health Care for Underserved Women. "Reproductive Life Planning to Reduce Unintended Pregnancy." Committee Opinion No. 654. *Obstetrics & Gynecology*: February 2016 - Volume 127 - Issue 2 - p e66-e69 DOI: 10.1097/AOG.0000000000001314



**Colorado Senate Health & Human Services Committee
Theresa Wrangham Testimony on SB 21-016
March 24, 2021**

Good afternoon, I am Theresa Wrangham, the executive director for the National Vaccine Information Center and a Colorado resident. While NVIC supports consumer access to preventative health measures, including vaccination, we must oppose SB-016, due to conflicts with existing federal law.

Under the [National Childhood Vaccine Injury Compensation Act of 1986](#), which NVIC's co-founders worked with Congress to draft and pass, it is required that parents and guardians receive CDC vaccine risk and benefit information from the vaccine provider prior to the vaccination of a minor. It also requires the provider to [record vaccine information into the minor's permanent medical record and parent and guardian access to that record](#). Without amendment, SB-016 would violate this federal requirement.

In addition, passage of SB-016 could jeopardize funding for [School Based Health Centers under the Affordable Care Act](#), which clearly states parental consent is required for services provided to children and adolescents in these centers. According to the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment over 30,000 children in Colorado receive primary and preventative health services in these centers and passage of SB-016 without amendment would negatively impact these centers.

[ACA](#) also already requires health insurance providers to cover vaccines, including HPV and Hepatitis B Vaccines for children without copays and deductibles and SB-016 is unnecessary in relation to financial barriers.

We have laws preventing minors from drinking, owning firearms, smoking and other activities due to their inability to make mature decisions. The [U.S. Supreme Court notes](#) that States make these types of valid limitations because "*minors often lack the experience, perspective, and judgment to recognize and avoid choices that could be detrimental to them.*" A [2017 study](#) examining the ability of children to make medical decisions echoed these valid limitations and found that adults are better in identifying risks than minors and that "*the parental role offers extra protection by creating the context for the child's competent decision-making and by facilitating the child's long term autonomy.*"

Passage of SB-016 would deny parents the ability to protect their child's legal vaccine injury compensation rights, as well as their duty to make medical risk-taking decisions that children are not ready to make for themselves until they become adults.

Respectfully, we ask that SB-016 be amended to uphold federal law relating to parental consent under ACA and parental informing, recording and access rights under the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, or that you oppose the bill. I welcome your questions.



SB21-016
Barbara Private to: committees.lcs.ga

03/24/2021 03:25 PM

I oppose strongly SB21-016
No minor should be able to make any medical decisions without the knowledge of
a parent or legal guardian!

VOTE NO ON SB21-016

Thank you
Barbara Schaer
7888 County Road 101 South
Alamosa, Co 81191
719 5883577

Sent from my iPhone



SB21-016 written testimony
mrs.crop-hepner to: committees.lcs.ga 03/24/2021 01:58 PM
Please respond to mrs.crop-hepner

2 Attachments



IMG_20210321_104022.jpg IMG_20210321_104022.jpg

Attached is My Why. I represent myself, my husband, and our 9 year old living with disabilities as a result of malpractice. As a resident of Denver proper, a business owner in Englewood, a CNA, and a mother to an intellectually brilliant yet physically disabled child, I OPPOSE SB016 on the grounds of COMMON / NATURAL LAW, Constitutional Rights, and The Geneva Convention. Regarding page 6, lines 8 and 9, it is UNETHICAL and INAPPROPRIATE to bypass parental involvement and consent for a minor's health decisions. It should remain the responsibility of the individual, their guardians, their doctor, and perhaps a social worker. More than ever, The People are watching politicians. Please STOP making ColoRADO a HOSTILE state to LIVE in. We really don't want to have to move our decade long running, multi-award winning family business out of this glorious land we've called home for all our lives!

I URGE amending /opposing this bill to PROTECT informed consent, autotomy, and The Geneva Conventions terms on parental rights.

Kindly,
Amanda Hepner
720-354-0939

Sent from ProtonMail mobile



SB21-016 OPPOSITION

prospinechiro to: committees.lcs.ga

Cc: "Office E-mail"

03/24/2021 03:28 PM

Hello committee,

I am writing to briefly oppose SB 21- 016. I oppose this bill on the following grounds. It is held that the Colorado Senate and lawmakers at large, support fully the unification, solidarity, and sovereignty of the nuclear family, and its preservation. Of the many tenants held at the core of the nuclear family, are that of maintaining child well-being, protection, and education. This bill appears to obfuscate the necessary dividing line between emergency care and wellness prevention. This bill does not simply allow for emergency medical procedures to be rendered when the parent is not present, however in fact allows for lifelong healthcare decisions to be made on the part of a minor. It cannot be believed that until the age of majority, or arguably there after, that individual minors have the experience and knowledge to make such determinations that may affect their long-term health and well-being. Without necessary experience and knowledge, the tenant of informed consent is lost on the unexperienced individual, therefore minimizing if not nullifying the true intent of fully informed consent and decision making on the well-being of the individual. This bill at face value appears to sideline those educated and experienced individuals in the nuclear family that might help make appropriate decision making on the parts of all of those involved yet to attain the age of majority.

As the state of Colorado has by and large enjoyed acceptable levels of vaccine uptake, it is not clear how this particular law would benefit the people of Colorado, and minors under the age of majority

As a whole. Considering the already acceptable levels of vaccination rates and necessary healthcare being rendered to individuals, this bill would only serve to needlessly increase state expenditures that are already increasing at a sufferable rate.

Considering the aforementioned, SB 21-016 appears and no way to be financially beneficial on the parts of Coloradoans as a whole, rather it would function to usurp and undermine the function of the nuclear family at large with regards to individuals within the nuclear family unit.

The loss of family sovereignty and cohesion that risks being lost by such a bill is only augmented further by its increased cost in enforcement by the state of Colorado.

This is an unnecessary bill that renders no real advantage, serving only to undermine the age of majority decision makers in the family unit. As such, this bill should be struck.

Thank you for your time and consideration .

Randall Moore DC CCSP

Healer, Motivator, Speaker, Author, Coach

On Purpose- helping others find and live theirs

Hello,

My name is Sara Holbrow I am submitting testimony on behalf of myself as well as my family today in regards to SB21-016.

The title "Preventative Health Care Coverage" is a deceptive title when you take a moment to look at this bill more in depth. This is dangerous legislation in more ways then one.

As I am sure you're aware Current law requires a health care provider or facility to preform a diagnostic exam for an STI and subsequently treat the STI at the request of a minor patient. There for it is not currently a prerequisite for a minor to receive preventive care, a health care provider however should counsel the minor on the importance of bringing the minors parent or legal guardian into the minors confidence regarding the services.

This bill changes current law from discussing services with a minor without notifying a parent or legal

guardian, to doctors prescribing and administering services to a minor without notifying a parent these include abortion, Hepatitis B and HPV vaccines.

A medical professional administering said services to a minor may not have the complete medical history of the minor and administer or prescribe medications or services that inadvertently harm the minor. Going against the Oath they take "first do no harm". This is of concern considering a child could have a serious and even life-threatening reaction to one of these vaccines without the parent ever knowing a vaccine was given. Consider that 64,473 adverse reactions have been reported to VAERS (Vaccine Adverse Reaction Event Reporting System) with the HPV vaccine alone. This could potentially waste precious time in reporting an event to VAERS that has a 3 year statute of limitations and getting a child the help they need.

Further more a child might have

little to no knowledge of allergies to vaccine ingredients or past vaccine reactions that they may have had. Minor children are at risk of being exploited by being coerced into vaccines their parents may strongly oppose. Children that are special needs or those with IEPs are at a higher risk of being exploited in these situations.

Important to note is SB21-016 would be in direct violation of two federal laws:

The 1986 National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act (42 U.S.C 300aa-26) and The Affordable Care act under Section 42 USC 280h-5. (a)(3)(b).

The Supreme Court stated "The Courts has held that the states validly may limit the freedom of children to choose for themselves in the making of important affirmative choice with potentially serious consequences. These rulings have been grounded in the recognition that, during the formative years of childhood

and adolescents, minors often lack the experience, perspective, and judgment to recognize and avoid choices that could be detrimental to them. Ginsberg vs New York, 390 U.S 629 (1986), illustrates well the Courts concerns over the inability of children to make mature choices, as First Amendment rights involved are very clear examples of constitutionally protected freedoms of choice."

Under the Affordable Care Act, health insurance plans are already required to cover vaccines- including HPV and Hepatitis B- for children with out co pays and deductibles under 2590.715-2713(a)(ii)-Coverage is preventative health services.

Making this legislation completely unnecessary!

At the very least SB21-016 Section 2 needs to be eliminated or amended as it has the potential to remove parents or guardians rights to choose for their child's health, and well being further chipping away at parental rights.

As where I do not agree with this legislation I'd urge that your VOTE NO on SB21-016. It is unnecessary legislation that violates current federal laws and has the potential of putting minors at risk.

Thank you for time and consideration.



March 16, 2021

Senate Health & Human Services Committee

Re: Letter of Support for SB21-016 Protecting Preventive Health Care Coverage

One Colorado Education Fund (OCEF) is the state's leading advocacy organization for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer Coloradans and their families. We have worked in a nonpartisan manner over the past eleven years to advance policy measures that help close the gap between legal and lived equality for LGBTQ Coloradans. Since our organization's founding, we have invested heavily in our health equity work to understand the challenges and barriers faced by the community in achieving a healthy life.

And it is with this understanding that we support SB21-016. The testing, prevention, and treatment of sexually transmitted infections are considered an effective public health strategy that also saves the public, providers, and the government money in the long term. For example, we know that individuals with say, untreated syphilis are more likely to contract new HIV infections. We also know that making sure someone with syphilis is able to access the antibiotics they need stops the spread of the infection and prevents secondary complications from developing in that person. If the life-time cost for HIV treatment is \$1m per person, it is well worth the cost to test and prevent. When we talk about STIs, we know that treatment is prevention.

Additionally, the ACA generally makes copay-free testing more accessible for women than men. Men don't have copay-free access to chlamydia and gonorrhea testing, and they can only get tested for syphilis without a copay if they're considered "high-risk." It makes no sense that only half the population is able to access the testing they need.

We would like to thank Senator's Pettersen and Moreno for bringing forth this legislation and ask for the committee's support of this bill.

Sincerely,

Michael Crews
Policy Director

Dear Colorado State Representatives,

I am writing in adamant opposition to SB 21-016. I find parts of this bill that are gravely concerning, particularly the sections that read:

SECTION 2. *In Colorado Revised Statutes, 25-4-409, amend 26 (1)(a) and (2) as follows:*

25-4-409. Minors - treatment - consent.

(1) (a) A health care provider or facility, if consulted by a patient who is a minor, shall perform, at the minor's request, a diagnostic examination for a sexually transmitted infection. The health care provider or facility shall treat the minor for a sexually transmitted infection, if necessary; discuss, ~~prevention~~ ADMINISTER, DISPENSE, OR PRESCRIBE PREVENTIVE measures OR MEDICATIONS, where applicable; and include appropriate therapies and prescriptions.

(2) The consent of a parent or legal guardian is not a prerequisite for a minor to receive a consultation, examination, PREVENTIVE CARE, or treatment for sexually transmitted infections. For the purposes of this section, health care provided to a minor is confidential, and information related to that care must not be divulged to any person other than the minor; except that the reporting required pursuant to the "Child Protection Act of 1987", part 3 of article 3 of title 19, ~~C.R.S.~~, still applies. If the minor is thirteen years of age or younger, the health care provider may involve the minor's parent or legal guardian. A health care provider shall counsel the minor on the importance of bringing ~~his or her~~ THE MINOR'S parent or legal guardian into the minor's confidence regarding the consultation, exam, or treatment.

I am utterly appalled at the level of overreach in this bill. Do we, or do we not consider 18 the legal age of adulthood in this country?! As a Colorado citizen, a taxpayer and above all a parent, I do NOT consent to my family or myself being governed this way and here are the many reasons I oppose this dangerous and egregious bill:

SB 016 Violates Parental Rights

- **SB 016** REQUIRES a health care provider to administer, dispense or prescribe preventative measures or medication, which includes vaccines, to a minor child whenever a child requests a diagnostic exam for a sexually transmitted infection (STI). (See bottom of Page 5 through line 7 on Page 6)
- Parental consent would not be required when a minor child is administered the HPV vaccine, the Hepatitis B vaccine or any future vaccine for a sexually transmitted disease.

- If the minor child is 13 years or older, the health care practitioner is even prohibited from disclosing to the parent that the child received a vaccine. (Page 6 lines 8-19)
- A minor child could have a serious and even life-threatening reaction to the vaccine without the parent knowing a vaccine had ever been given.
- Minor children are at high risk of being exploited by persuading health care providers to receive vaccines that their parents may be strongly opposed to them receiving. Special needs children or children with IEPs are at even greater risk to be given vaccines parents may not want their child to receive.

Minors as Young as 9 Years Old can be Vaccinated Without Parental Knowledge or Consent Putting Them at Risk

- Current Colorado law [C.R.S. 25-4-409](#) (1)(a) states- A health care provider or facility, if consulted by a patient who is a minor, shall perform, at the minor's request, a diagnostic examination for a sexually transmitted infection. The health care provider or facility **shall treat the minor** for a sexually transmitted infection, if necessary; discuss prevention measures, where applicable; and include appropriate therapies and prescriptions. Section (2) states -The consent of a parent or legal guardian is not a prerequisite for a minor to receive a consultation, examination, or treatment for sexually transmitted infections. SB 016 amends this language to include **preventive care**. Vaccines are considered preventive care **so this bill would change the law to require minors to be vaccinated without parental knowledge or consent**.
- Current law also states - If the minor is thirteen years of age or younger, the health care provider **may** involve the minor's parent or legal guardian. This means while they “may” involve the parent they do not have to. Therefore, a child as young as 9 years old could be vaccinated for HPV without the knowledge or consent of the parent or guardian because this is the recommended age for [HPV for both boys and girls](#).

Serious Questions on HPV Vaccine Efficacy, Necessity and Safety Remain

- HPV vaccines have *not* been proven to prevent cancer of any kind and no participants in the original HPV clinical trials received true saline placebos.
- The clinical trials never investigated the vaccine’s possible effects on human fertility or potential to cause cancer.
- With over 200 types, [HPV is the most common STD in the US](#). HPV infection is experienced by the majority of sexually active women and men without symptoms and is naturally cleared from the body within two years by more than 90 % of those who become infected.
- Any students that have already been exposed to HPV 16 or 18 prior to receiving HPV vaccine, increases their risk of precancerous lesions, or worse, by 44.6%, according to data Merck provided to the FDA before Gardasil was approved in 2006. (See [VRBPAC Background document](#), bottom of page 13)
- As of March 4, 2020, there were 64,473 [vaccine reaction reports](#) made to the federal Vaccine Adverse Events Reporting System (VAERS) associated with HPV vaccines. 8,936 were classified as serious reactions, and included unexplained collapse, seizures, muscle pain and weakness; disabling fatigue, paralysis, brain inflammation, rheumatoid arthritis, lupus, blood clots, multiple sclerosis, optic neuritis, spontaneous abortions, lupus, strokes, cardiac issues, seizures/convulsions, and many other health problems. There were also 528 reports of death. (VAERS reporting is voluntary and it receives reports for only a [small fraction of actual adverse events](#))

Disregards Federal Law and Supreme Court Decision

- The [National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act \(42 U.S.C. §300aa-26\)](#), a federal law, requires the parent or guardian of a minor child to be given a VIS (Vaccine Information Statement) before vaccines are given. The CDC on their [Q&A page on VIS sheets](#): Under the question “Is there a

requirement to verify that parents/legal representatives have actually received and reviewed the VIS,” the answer is a clear undebatable “YES”. This bill ignores the federal law and requirement that VIS be given to the parent or guardian.

- When the [National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act](#) of 1986 was passed, Congress never contemplated or provided for a minor child making the decision to get a vaccine without their parent or guardian. The Act clearly states that before the administration of [certain vaccines](#), a health care provider shall give a copy of the CDC’s vaccine information materials to either, “*the parent or legal representative of any child to whom the provider intends to administer such vaccine, or to any [adult](#) to whom the provider intends to administer such vaccine.*” There is no provision in the law that allows a health care provider to give a minor child the Vaccine Information Statement (VIS) materials for the purpose of consenting, without the parent’s knowledge or consent, to the administration of vaccines.
- By receiving a federally recommended vaccine, a minor child is giving up the legal rights to file an injury claim in a federal or state civil court of law, even if the child suffers brain injury or another permanent health problem from the vaccine. A minor child cannot fully understand the terms of the Vaccine Injury Act including the three year statute of limitations on filing a vaccine injury claim with the [Vaccine Injury Compensation Program](#). The Act’s vaccine injury table lists certain injuries that may only be eligible to receive compensation if they occur within 30 days of vaccination. Minors would be solely responsible for getting confirmation and documentation that they have an injury on this chart within 30 days of vaccination and many minors cannot drive themselves to the doctor or hospital.
- Minor children would not know that by asking for a diagnostic examination for a sexually transmitted infection that they are effectively agreeing to preventative treatment including receiving a vaccine as mandated by the state.
- States have the right to restrict minors from making major decisions without parental consent because minors lack the ability and experience to make informed and mature choices.

The Supreme Court stated, “[T]he Court has held that the States validly may limit the freedom of children to choose for themselves in the making of important, affirmative choices with potentially serious consequences. These rulings have been grounded in the recognition that, during the formative years of childhood and adolescence, minors often lack the experience, perspective, and judgment to recognize and avoid choices that could be detrimental to them. *Ginsberg v. New York*, [390 U.S. 629](#) (1968), illustrates well the Court’s concern over the inability of children to make mature choices, as the First Amendment rights involved are clear examples of constitutionally protected freedoms of choice.”

Not Necessary

- Health insurance plans are already [required to cover vaccines](#) including HPV and Hepatitis B Vaccines for children without copays and deductibles as required by the ACA (Affordable Care Act), § 2590.715-2713(a)(ii) - [Coverage of preventive health services](#).

Jeopardizes Federal Funding for SBHC

- ACA provides grants to School Based Health Centers (SBHC) under [Section 42 USC 280h-5. \(a\)\(3\)\(b\)](#) and clearly states parental consent is required for services provided to those children and adolescents in these centers. Providing services, including vaccines, to minors without parental consent at SBHCs could jeopardize federal funding.

Allows Minors to be Vaccinated at School Clinics without Parental Knowledge or Consent

- According to the [Colorado Health Institute](#) in 2015, roughly 35,000 Colorado children received primary and preventive health care services in SBHC. If SB 016 is passed, those preventive services for STIs, including vaccines, can be administered at SBHC without parental consent or knowledge.

Remember, it is your duty to represent the fine citizens of this state. I am certain that the majority of Colorado citizens, if they were aware of this horrendous bill, would oppose such government overreach on parental rights. Do what is right... VOTE NO on SB 21-016.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Janine Sluder

Senate Health & Human Services Committee Hearing
SB21-016 Protecting Preventive Health Care
Wednesday, March 24, 2021

Chairperson Fields and distinguished members of the Committee; my name is Ingrid Moore, from Longmont. I'm a concerned citizen writing on my own behalf **in support of** Senate Bill 21-016.

I strongly support this bill and urge you to vote Yes.

- It is important that these preventive services be added to required preventive services and codified into Colorado law in case there is a change to the federal Affordable Care Act.
- This is a reasonable bill and will provide assurance to women that these necessary services will be reimbursed by insurance.
- Doing this will also lower future costs for treatment of diseases that could have been prevented.

Please vote YES on this important legislation.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Ingrid Moore
Longmont, Colorado
16 March, 2021