

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

**Eightieth Session  
February 19, 2019**

The Committee on Education was called to order by Chairman Tyrone Thompson at 1:31 p.m. on Tuesday, February 19, 2019, in Room 3138 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at [www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/80th2019](http://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/80th2019).

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson, Chairman  
Assemblyman Edgar Flores, Vice Chairman  
Assemblywoman Bea Duran  
Assemblywoman Michelle Gorelow  
Assemblywoman Alexis Hansen  
Assemblywoman Melissa Hardy  
Assemblywoman Lisa Krasner  
Assemblywoman Brittney Miller  
Assemblywoman Connie Munk  
Assemblywoman Jill Tolles  
Assemblywoman Selena Torres

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Assemblywoman Sarah Peters (excused)

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

None

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Kelly Richard, Committee Policy Analyst  
Victoria Gonzalez, Committee Counsel  
Sharon McCallen, Committee Secretary  
Trinity Thom, Committee Assistant



**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Cyrus Hojjaty, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Heidi S. Parker, Executive Director, Immunize Nevada  
Shannon Bennett, Manager, Immunization Program, Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services  
Donna West, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Nikki Aaker, Director, Carson City Health and Human Services  
Catherine M. O'Mara, Executive Director, Nevada State Medical Association  
Steve Kutz, Director, Community and Clinical Health Services Division, Washoe County Health District  
Natha C. Anderson, President, Washoe Education Association; and representing Nevada State Education Association  
Sara Cholhagian, representing Dignity Health-St. Rose Dominican Hospitals  
Mary Pierczynski, representing Nevada Association of School Superintendents; and Nevada Association of School Administrators  
Paige Barnes, representing Nevada Association of School Boards  
Michael Hackett, representing Nevada Public Health Association; and Nevada Primary Care Association  
Elisa Cafferata, representing Planned Parenthood Votes Nevada  
Jared Busker, Associate Director, Children's Advocacy Alliance  
Jennifer Gilmore, representing Nevada Advocates for Planned Parenthood Affiliates  
Scott A. Sabraw, representing Clark County Education Association  
Mackenzie Baysinger, representing Human Services Network  
John Sande, IV, representing Southern Nevada Health District  
Matthew Shiel, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada  
Nancy Jones, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada  
Annette Mather, Private Citizen, Sparks, Nevada  
Mia Lowry, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Denise Mraz, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Wiz Rouzard, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Cindy Lake, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Linda Cundiff, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada  
Katania Taylor, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada  
Jami Hepworth, Private Citizen, Gardnerville, Nevada  
Bret Corbett, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada  
Brittany Sheehan, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Daphne Lee, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Tasha Heath, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Christina Lovato, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Kathy Spicuzza, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Sara Yelowitz, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada  
Deirdre Mazzetto, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada  
Candice Liddell, Private Citizen, Gardnerville, Nevada  
Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Families for Freedom

Joy Davis, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada  
Lynn Chapman, State Vice President, Nevada Eagle Forum  
Diane Bishop, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Sarah McDuffie, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
T. Matthew Phillips, Private Citizen, North Las Vegas, Nevada  
Carla Shiel, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Taree Waterman, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Kristen Krusyna, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Nicole Stoke, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Elizabeth Reza, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Romina Lizaso, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Justine Nikoleit, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Timothy Burch, Administrator, Human Services, Department of Social Service and Family Services, Clark County

**Chairman Thompson:**

[Roll was called. Committee rules and protocol were explained.] We will be hearing one bill today, Assembly Bill 123. The bill will be presented and then I will give people the opportunity to speak in support for two minutes or less. Please try not to repeat testimony from those before you. If you want to say "ditto," that is fine and your name will be on the record. I will also allow those to speak who are in opposition or neutral.

I will allow those who are here for public comment to speak at this time.

**Cyrus Hojjaty, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I was trying to address to the people the heart of our education problem—and I know it is because of a federal court case—but we are never going to really understand the heart of our education problem if we do not understand who is attending these public schools. I was looking at some data from the Center for Immigration Studies. Roughly 20 percent to 25 percent of students—probably about 25 percent to 30 percent in Clark County—who attend public schools have a parent who is not lawfully in this country. This really has something to do with our performance and our overcrowding. If you are bringing in low-skill people and people who are disproportionately taking English language learners courses, you are going to have an effect on your school performance. It is no wonder why we are, in many cases, the bottom five in our school performance. I want to know, as a citizen of the United States, how am I personally benefiting from this. I have looked at previous presentations and many of the people who spoke say the demographics are changing and it has been doing that for 20 or 30 years. If these demographics are changing, how do we know we are headed in the right direction? You guys admit that certain types of people perform less and those people are increasing in shares. How do we know we are headed in the right direction? If we have 22 percent of the students who are in that situation, which I believe is the highest in the United States, you are not going to solve the heart of the problem—the elephant in the room. Please consider that. We need to have more discussion about this. I am a taxpayer, and a large part of our sales and property tax goes to this.

**Chairman Thompson:**

Is there anyone else for public comment in Las Vegas or in Carson City? [There was no one.] I will open the hearing for Assembly Bill 123.

**Assembly Bill 123: Revises provisions governing the requirements concerning immunizations of pupils for purposes of enrollment in school. (BDR 34-593)**

**Assemblywoman Connie Munk, Assembly District No. 4:**

I am pleased to present Assembly Bill 123 for your consideration. Joining me today is Shannon Bennett, who is the manager of the Immunization Program for the Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services. I am also joined by Heidi Parker, the Executive Director of Immunize Nevada. I want to make it clear before I make my comments that this bill does not, and I repeat, does not require parents to vaccinate their children. This bill does improve the response time in case of an outbreak of a vaccine-preventable disease from the Nevada school districts to the public health representatives.

Some of us may remember the times when chicken pox, measles, mumps, and whooping cough were common. I am a mother of three grown children, I am a mental health professional, and I am also a breast cancer survivor. In my lifetime, I have experienced and seen enough diseases. I would be happy to see some of them gone forever thanks to immunizations.

Unfortunately, some of these preventable diseases are making a comeback. For example, in 2000 measles were declared eliminated in the United States by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Fast-forward to January 2019, Governor Jay Inslee of the state of Washington had to declare a state of emergency due to the measles outbreak in Washington. As of yesterday, there were 63 cases of known measles outbreaks. We do not want to experience that here in Nevada.

Our children should not be affected by any of these preventable diseases anymore. Schools are ideal breeding grounds for highly contagious diseases, like measles. This is why Nevada law requires a child who is enrolled in school to be immunized against certain diseases. However, exemptions from this law are allowed for medical reasons or for religious beliefs. These exemptions are maintained under A.B. 123. We also have a law in Nevada that schools must keep records for student immunizations. This record-keeping should assist with compliance and help lower infection risk for immunization-exempt students or students who are opted out.

In the case of an outbreak of a disease at a school, an exempted student is not allowed to attend school. This benefits the student by lowering his or her infection risk and also prevents further spreading of the disease in the community. However, our current law has some flaws that must be addressed. First, it is important to rapidly identify those opted-out students without required immunizations during an outbreak of a preventable disease in order

to lower the infection risk and further spreading of the disease. Public health authorities have reported cases of slow response times with schools in Nevada during such outbreaks because sometimes schools did not properly collect or maintain student immunization records as required by law.

Secondly, as of now, state, county, or city public health authorities only have access to these student records when there is already an outbreak of the disease. They cannot identify gaps in the coverage related to immunization-exempt students, students who are opted out, or students who do not have a required booster for certain immunizations. Therefore, we are reacting to these diseases when instead we should be proactive and prevent them from happening or spreading.

Assembly Bill 123 aims to fix these issues. This bill will clarify that school districts could and should improve their response times to health districts during an outbreak. My copresenters will explain the specifics.

**Heidi S. Parker, Executive Director, Immunize Nevada:**

I would like to thank Assemblywoman Munk for her interest in the need for accurate school immunization data and to her constituents for bringing their concerns to her. I would also like to thank Chairman Thompson and the Committee members for hearing this bill today. Before I walk you through the bill and the friendly amendment, I have some quick background information to share about vaccine exemption laws and the importance of accurate and timely sharing of data.

The health, safety, and economic impact of vaccines are why all states require immunizations to be up to date for public and private school attendance. Individual state law not only establishes exemptions for school vaccination requirements, but also establishes requirements regarding the exemption process and the implications of an exemption in the event of an outbreak. Additionally, there are explicit statements under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) that allow for information sharing of student and patient information during an outbreak. This sharing has occurred with previous outbreaks in Nevada schools, but it also applies to all disease outbreaks, not just those that are vaccine-preventable, such as the norovirus. Additionally, schools and public health authorities already work together to identify trends in chronic diseases, student injuries, childhood obesity, and more.

Assemblywoman Munk outlined what is currently in the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS), so we know we allow medical and religious exemptions with a parental affidavit that students are excluded under an outbreak. Exemptions are to be submitted to the board of trustees or a governing body. Current NRS also makes it a misdemeanor if a parent or guardian refuses to remove their child from school when required by law. Additionally, current NRS also requires immunization rates to be self-reported annually by both schools and childcare accommodation facilities by December 31 to the Division of Public and Behavioral Health. Immunize Nevada has collaborated with the Division to develop a web-based portal to fulfill this mandate.

As you will hear later from Ms. Bennett, the current information received is not robust enough to fully track where potential hotspots are in schools with low immunization rates. The self-reported rate provides an aggregate number which does not provide the full story. It is a lot like the CliffsNotes version. The Division needs to have the exemption totals on an annual basis in order to effectively prevent and prepare for potential outbreaks, but also have a starting point if an outbreak is declared. As my submitted statement on measles outbreaks [pages 4-5, ([Exhibit C](#))] outlines, these disease outbreaks are costly for public health, health care, schools, families, and the broader community. Working to prevent outbreaks is not only a best practice, but it makes economic sense, especially in our state where we are facing both public health and education funding challenges.

With an estimated 800 schools in Nevada, the capacity for error and interpretation of current law is immense. Please reference the submitted example form I provided that one school had developed on their own [page 3, ([Exhibit C](#))]. They have added the word "personal," which is not actually a valid reason for exemption under NRS, nor does Nevada law provide the requirement of notarization. We also have reports of schools not accepting a religious exemption, which is required by law. This is why a standardized process is also necessary; it will reduce the burden the state has placed on schools to manage this process without clear guidelines or resources. Additionally, as many nurses cover multiple schools, it is often the front desk staff or clinical aide who has these conversations with parents and he or she may not be adequately prepared.

Our coalition partners have been requesting standardized required forms for a number of years. In response, Immunize Nevada researched and developed a form for religious exemptions [page 6, ([Exhibit C](#))] based on expert recommendations, other states' forms, and feedback from stakeholders, along with a risks and responsibilities flyer [pages 7-8, ([Exhibit C](#))] for school nurses to use. We have not yet developed a medical exemption form, but including CDC-recognized contraindications and precautions for immunization—and whether it is temporary or permanent—is a best practice to ensure medical exemptions are not being misused.

Before I go through the bill, I would like to have Ms. Bennett share her information.

**Shannon Bennett, Manager, Immunization Program, Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services:**

The Division of Public and Behavioral Health has experienced challenges with timeliness when working with schools to properly exclude children during a vaccine-preventable disease outbreak. During a 2017 pertussis outbreak in rural Nevada that sickened 28 people, it took over a week for a school in the community to send a list of medically and religiously exempt school children to the Division after it was requested. Although the school did exclude these children as quickly as possible, this was challenging for the Division and made responses to the disease outbreak difficult, as the Division's disease investigators were uncertain of the exact situation at the school.

Disease can spread quickly. Timeliness is extremely important to protect the vulnerable and prevent further spread of disease. Assembly Bill 123 will assist in these situations because it will ensure the children are properly documented and recorded with the health authorities at the beginning of the school year. It will ensure enhanced communication between the school districts, the Division, and local health authorities during and before an outbreak. In addition to outbreak response, the bill will assist the Division and local health authorities in understanding where pockets of need may be for further education and vaccination rate monitoring.

**Heidi Parker:**

Looking at the bill, as you have heard, the intent is to require that this information regarding exemptions be submitted to certain public health agencies ([Exhibit D](#)). Section 2 of the bill addresses the annual reporting of exemption information to the Division of Public and Behavioral Health. We have included changes to this section in our amendment ([Exhibit E](#)), which I will address in a moment. It additionally outlines disclosure of the exemption information during an outbreak to the responding agencies.

Section 3 of the bill indicates that the exemption statement must include the child's name and the school where the child is enrolled, and that statement must include consent related to the outbreak situation described in section 2.

Section 4 of the bill requests a medical exemption be signed by a licensed physician or advanced practice registered nurse (APRN) and include the same information of the child's name, school of enrollment, and requires the statement be submitted annually. Sections 6 through 9 of the bill repeats that language for private schools.

I would like to quickly walk through the friendly amendment ([Exhibit E](#)). I would also like to provide an example from a school district of their current process related to religious and medical exemptions. The amendment updates section 2 of the bill to reflect the request for information be submitted on a de-identified list. We received feedback that the bill language was not the best way to do this. There are easy ways to do this as a de-identified list, and everyone is in agreement that this would be the preferred method. The amendment then outlines that in an outbreak situation, the governing body would then be responsible for submitting the identified information to the appropriate health agencies, but that identifying information would otherwise remain confidential.

The amendment also requires that religious exemptions are also filed annually on a form prescribed by the Division of Public and Behavioral Health. As you have heard, the Division not only needs an accurate list of how many exemptions have been filed, but having a standard process and form guarantees that each school is following the same policy and that all schools are in compliance with collecting, tracking, and reporting immunization data, not just the medical exemptions.

The amendment also adds the license number of the physician or Advanced Practice Registered Nurse (APRN), ensuring they have the authority to write the exemption, and adds the prescribed form. This is a recommended best practice to curb issues that states are facing with the validity of medical exemptions, providers selling exemptions, and other challenges.

I would like to provide a quick example of the Elko County School District. They are currently using the religious exemption form that Immunize Nevada developed [page 6, ([Exhibit C](#))], and I would like to walk you through their process as it is actually very similar to the process this bill would implement. When a parent requests a religious exemption, they use this form at each school site. In order to comply with current NRS, a parent or guardian signature is required and then a signature from the school board. Once the parent returns the completed form, the student may enroll. A copy is made and retained at the school site, the original is sent to the central office for acknowledgement and signature by the school board, and then it is returned to the school. For a medical exemption, parents are required to submit a statement from their physician stating that an immunization exemption is medically necessary. Once the statement is submitted, the student is allowed to enroll. There is a tab in the student's Infinite Campus record to identify both types of exemptions. The exemption that applies to the student is marked and in an outbreak situation, the school can easily pull the list from Infinite Campus to assess which students need to be excluded. Because the list can easily be pulled, under this bill, the school would also be able to de-identify that list and forward it to the Division of Public and Behavioral Health.

For public schools, Infinite Campus provides the mechanism necessary to easily track these exemptions, and the usage of the prescribed form ensures data is accurate and standardized. We are available to answer any questions.

**Chairman Thompson:**

Are there any questions from the Committee?

**Assemblywoman Miller:**

Thank you for the bill presentation. I appreciate Assemblywoman Munk's addressing at the beginning one of the major concerns that this bill is not requiring students to be vaccinated. However, I do have some questions about having a physician or an APRN complete the forms when it is for health reasons, yet what would be a religious reason?

**Heidi Parker:**

We are not asking for a physician signature for a religious exemption. There is a prescribed form for religious exemptions [page 6, ([Exhibit C](#))]. The statement from a physician or APRN is only required for health reasons.

**Assemblywoman Miller:**

For a religious exemption, there would be no required signature. From speaking with people and from the emails and letters I have received, I believe the concern is the potential issues that can occur once that information leaves the schools. We know the schools already know the students who are not vaccinated. I have to think about unintended consequences. I know



there is an amendment to not identify the student by name. Can you tell me how much protection there will be to not identify that student and to make sure the information is not used in any destructive way toward the students or families?

**Heidi Parker:**

That is actually the main reason for the amendment and the de-identified list on an annual basis. The Division just needs to know the numbers in an outbreak situation. I do not know if Ms. Bennett can speak to this in any more detail, but the intent would be that the school has to provide the excluded students. There are contacts that need to be notified. There are different public health responses that have to happen in that situation. Again, the bill does note that otherwise the information does stay confidential. I do not see any change from current practice. Nevada has experienced outbreaks, such as the norovirus outbreak and pertussis. The mechanism currently in place would be the same.

**Assemblywoman Miller:**

I appreciate that the student's information will be private and only aggregate numbers will be shared. I know the intention is to inform students that there is an outbreak and they may be at risk. In the case of an outbreak where the students have to be identified, and because our schools—especially in Clark County and in certain areas of Washoe County—are in close proximity, are we just concerned with that particular school geographically? Obviously, there are siblings who may go to a surrounding school, and in some cases we have students going across town because of magnet schools, charter schools, or private schools. If there is an outbreak at one particular school, how would the decision be made as to what schools will be affected?

**Shannon Bennett:**

We have state epidemiologists who are able to work through all of those details. Each case is different and every scenario is different. They take all of the issues you mentioned into account when making a decision of how to handle the outbreak.

**Assemblywoman Krasner:**

I have received many emails regarding this bill, specifically regarding language in section 4, subsection 2, and section 8, subsection 2. Both of those sections state, "A child who is excluded from school pursuant to this section shall be deemed to be a neglected child for the purposes of NRS 432.097. . . ." Why is that language in the bill?

**Heidi Parker:**

I cannot actually speak to that specific sentence. Clark County has submitted an amendment ([Exhibit F](#)). I am not sure if they will be providing more information. That is more in the area of child welfare.

**Assemblywoman Munk:**

We do have two friendly amendments that we are working on and one of them addresses that language. I do believe that language is going to be eliminated.

**Chairman Thompson:**

I am looking at the proposed amendment from Clark County ([Exhibit F](#)). Is this a friendly amendment?

**Assemblywoman Munk:**

Yes, it is a friendly amendment.

**Chairman Thompson:**

The whole idea of school is for us to keep kids in school. If this form is not completed, it says the child will be excluded from going to school. It seems like it is missing something. We should have advocacy that is working to get that student in school. Is there anything in place in this bill indicating the students who have not submitted the form? Who is knocking on doors, calling, emailing, or texting to see what is going on?

**Heidi Parker:**

I would be happy to address what Immunize Nevada has done in years past to help ensure students start school on time. We work closely with a number of community partners to provide access, meaning free immunization clinics throughout the two months before school starts. Those are in areas of need and we make sure they are accessible to everyone. We work closely with the school nurses to promote those clinics so families who are struggling with access know how to get their children up to date on time.

We do have a full-time staff person dedicated to school immunizations and school outreach. She actually works full-time throughout the year to ensure school nurses and the school staff have all the resources they need to ensure students are able to start school on time.

**Chairman Thompson:**

I know you did not say her name, but does she have access to the list of students who are excluded? I understand all the services, but who knocks on the doors, calls, emails, or texts? Who is responsible for that step?

**Heidi Parker:**

Because of FERPA, Immunize Nevada does not have access to that list. However, in the end, it is the school's responsibility. Immunize Nevada is working closely with the schools to make sure they have the resources to follow up with those parents, such as providing them the information as to where they can access vaccines within their ZIP Code. The school nurse and the school staff are ultimately the ones helping those families start school on time.

**Assemblywoman Munk:**

I believe Clark County will be testifying later, so we will be able to get a little more clarification on the amendment.

**Chairman Thompson:**

Are there any further questions from the Committee? [There were none.] Is there anyone present, either in Las Vegas or Carson City, who would like to testify in support of the bill?

**Donna West, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am here today to support Assembly Bill 123 as a concerned grandmother. My oldest grandson, Bennett, is 10 years old. He has a life-threatening egg allergy that means he cannot be vaccinated against measles, mumps, and rubella (MMR). His allergist will not administer the MMR vaccine to him in a hospital setting because it is too dangerous. Because he cannot be vaccinated and is exempt, it is important that the health district be able to notify his parents and the parents of other unvaccinated children in the event of a measles, mumps, or rubella outbreak. It is vital that our county health departments be able to quickly and consistently access vaccination records maintained by our school districts. As I understand it, there are schools in Nevada that keep exemption information on sticky notes in student files. That risks the loss of information and it also makes it time-consuming for county health departments to gather the information to contact parents. The health departments need to be able to identify and notify parents of unvaccinated students quickly and easily to contain any outbreak of disease. Parents need this information to protect their children. I urge you to pass Assembly Bill 123.

**Nikki Aaker, Director, Carson City Health and Human Services:**

A community with high immunization rates of vaccine-preventable diseases is a healthy community. On the other hand, when a school has high exemptions, it equates to a low vaccination rate and puts that school at risk for an outbreak. According to the CDC, studies have shown that high exemptions tend to cluster geographically, putting children and others who cannot get vaccinated because of age, chemotherapy treatments, allergies, or those who are immunologically compromised, at risk for vaccine-preventable diseases that can cause serious illness or death. When, not if, we are facing a public health outbreak, it is important for my agency to know the number of children in schools who have an exemption and the type of exemption in order to plan for interventions and outreach.

Assemblywoman Munk brought up the measles outbreak in Washington. Of those 63 cases, there were 54 individuals who were not vaccinated and 2 who received one dose of MMR. In the event of a disease outbreak, it is very important for local health authorities to know the exemption rates for the area schools so public health personnel can focus their efforts on those schools with low vaccination rates. These efforts include interventions and preventative measures. Disease outbreaks are very time-consuming, labor-intensive, and very costly, as evidenced by the 2017 measles outbreak in Minnesota during which 79 individuals contracted measles, most of them children. That outbreak cost the health department \$2.3 million during the five-month outbreak.

**Catherine M. O'Mara, Executive Director, Nevada State Medical Association:**

Nevada physicians support A.B. 123. We believe this bill provides accurate, standardized public reporting which will promote the health of Nevada, particularly our schoolchildren and our teachers. In addition, we support this bill because it allows the public health agencies to respond to outbreaks of contagious diseases as we have seen in Oregon and Washington. It also provides a standardized form. Many of you have heard the physician community is concerned about paperwork. In this case, we appreciate a standardized form that allows doctors to do their job more efficiently.

I want to put on the record that the American Academy of Pediatrics' comprehensive guidelines for well-child care recommend an annual visit. Those annual visits are covered health plans compliant under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

**Steve Kutz, Director, Community and Clinical Health Services Division, Washoe County Health District:**

I did submit written testimony ([Exhibit G](#)) on behalf of the Washoe County Health District, but I would like to make a few points. Not only are we concerned with safe and healthy schools, we are very much in support of a more proactive approach, as Assemblywoman Munk stated. We want to avoid some exorbitant costs to local health authorities and public health entities that are already strained. As you may know, Nevada is ranked fiftieth in spending for public health. In 2011 Minnesota had 22 cases of measles. The cost to the health authorities was estimated to be \$900,000 to \$1.6 million. Clark County, Washington, which was mentioned earlier and based on information I had as of last week, had 50-plus cases. If we take the Minnesota costs and applied that to what is going on in Washington, predicted costs there are about \$2 million to \$4 million. We had one case reported in 2018 within Washoe County. That case was a University of Nevada, Reno student, and it cost us over 300 man-hours and over \$16,000.

I would like to say that the Washoe County Health District appreciates the support of good public health practices and we look forward to working with our partners, such as Immunize Nevada and our local schools, to protect the health of Nevadans.

**Natha C. Anderson, President, Washoe Education Association; and representing Nevada State Education Association:**

The Nevada State Education Association represents teachers and education support professionals across the state. We believe that every Nevada student deserves a high-quality public education that is also safe. The Nevada State Education Association supports [A.B. 123](#) requiring information about student immunizations be provided to health officials, which could prove critical in containing an outbreak of disease preventable by these immunizations. This mechanism and consistent paperwork could limit the risk to students and educators at school sites. The Nevada State Education Association appreciates the sensitivity of this issue and believes [A.B. 123](#) strikes the right balance between religious freedoms, confidentiality of health information, and protection of public health. [Written testimony in support from Nevada State Education Association ([Exhibit H](#)) was also submitted.]

**Sara Chohagian, representing Dignity Health-St. Rose Dominican Hospitals:**

On behalf of Dignity Health-St. Rose Dominican Hospitals in Nevada, we would like to formally support [A.B. 123](#) and thank Assemblywoman Munk for bringing this measure forward. We also want to recognize the importance of accurate health care information in our statement, and we echo the comments of Ms. O'Mara.

**Mary Pierczynski, representing Nevada Association of School Superintendents; and Nevada Association of School Administrators:**

We are in support of this bill and appreciate the fact that we can use the Infinite Campus mechanism for keeping records.

**Paige Barnes, representing Nevada Association of School Boards:**

We are here in support for all the reasons previously stated.

**Michael Hackett, representing Nevada Public Health Association; and Nevada Primary Care Association:**

I do not think it can be overstated how important information sharing is, both from the public health perspective as well as for safety net providers. Any efforts that can be made to improve how that information is shared are something we wholeheartedly support. We would like to be on record in support of this bill.

**Elisa Cafferata, representing Planned Parenthood Votes Nevada:**

We have been coming to the Legislature for several years in support of the full range of women's health care. Many vaccinations are critical to future fertility and family planning options. We support this bill in support of the future health of as many Nevadans as possible.

**Jared Busker, Associate Director, Children's Advocacy Alliance:**

I would like to say, me too.

**Jennifer Gilmore, representing Nevada Advocates for Planned Parenthood Affiliates:**

As a mother and a social worker, I want to say I support this bill for reasons already stated.

**Scott A. Sabraw, representing Clark County Education Association:**

On behalf of our 18,000 licensed professionals, I would like to say, ditto.

**Mackenzie Baysinger, representing Human Services Network:**

I would also like to say, me too.

**John Sande, IV, representing Southern Nevada Health District:**

I would also like to express our support. Dr. Joe Iser, Chief Health Officer, Southern Nevada Health District, submitted a letter of support ([Exhibit I](#)), which you will find on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System.

**Chairman Thompson:**

Is there anyone else wishing to testify in support of the bill? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to testify in opposition to the bill?

**Matthew Shiel, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada:**

I drove here from Henderson. Here are my daughter's ashes. [He held up an urn.] She was a Henderson baby. All of my children were vaccinated. She died within 24 hours of the MMR and DTaP [diphtheria, tetanus, and pertussis] vaccine. She had a textbook, mortal

adverse reaction to the vaccines. You have gone into all this reporting of data, but when someone dies or gets injured, the federal government has a self-reporting system. This is all about sales and marketing for doing more immunizations. People who are vaccine-injured are a minority, and this is picking on them. They should be protected. The federal government has paid out \$4 billion since 1986 for people who have died or been injured. You are here to make Nevada a gateway, not to make our children pincushions for profit under the ruse of public health. Well, guess what? The measles vaccine is a live virus. People who get the measles vaccine can give measles to people who are unvaccinated. That whole egg thing earlier is a joke. This is very serious business. You need to do your research on this. This is our children. Do not let these paid people say stuff to you. Really think about it. What would you do if your child died? What would you do? We are talking about death and injury today, and we are saying it is for the greater good. It is against our rights to have our children labeled, identified, and pulled out of school when they are injured or have a religious exemption. What is going to happen when you take away our religious or medical exemptions? It is expensive to get a medical exemption. I am okay because my daughter died, but what about people who have other challenges? You are picking on a minority in our community and it is unconstitutional and it is unethical. This is my daughter. [He held up a picture of his daughter.] I drove all the way from Henderson because I wanted to look you all in the eyes. This is a serious business. These are our children and the future of Nevada. Take it seriously.

**Nancy Jones, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:**

I am representing Nevada Families for Freedom, and I am also here representing myself as a mother who has children in the public school district in Douglas County. It sounds like there are some amendments in place that address some of the concerns Nevada Families for Freedom and I have with this bill. Specifically, the note about children being labeled as neglected is extreme and frightening. That is what is frightening to most people who have read this bill. When you read through this bill and find out in order to exercise your right to a religious or medical exemption, you have to voluntarily consent to have your child's name and school released. Religious and medical information is no longer private. That is frightening to people and I do not think it is right. The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) already protects the privacy of students. This law is completely redundant. In circumstances such as state emergencies or disasters, FERPA allows for that information to be released to proper authorities so there can be greater awareness of outbreaks and things like that we are concerned about.

I would also like to share a bit of my personal experience with this issue. My husband has a Ph.D. in microbiology and immunology. I have a master's degree and I am a product of a Nevada education, graduating from Las Vegas Academy of the Arts. My favorite English teacher at that school taught us to dig deeper. Our first two daughters were taken regularly to be vaccinated and we did not see any problems. My third daughter has been injured and would be unable to get them at this point. [Also submitted are ([Exhibit J](#)), ([Exhibit K](#)), ([Exhibit L](#)), ([Exhibit M](#)), ([Exhibit N](#)), ([Exhibit O](#)), ([Exhibit P](#)), ([Exhibit Q](#)), and ([Exhibit R](#))].

**Annette Mather, Private Citizen, Sparks, Nevada:**

Assembly Bill 123 should be opposed for the following reasons: NRS 394.192 does not list the CDC-recommended vaccinations, and this list changes. It is irresponsible to create a mandate with an ambiguous and ever-changing vaccine schedule. Let the CDC and the physicians provide transparent recommendations and let the parents decide which is best for their families. The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act was already mentioned. The federal government already protects the rights. It sounds like one of the issues is actually getting the schools in compliance with having the records set up and established timely. It is an administrative burden for the schools. As we can see, they are already overwhelmed if they cannot keep track of that sort of information.

**Mia Lowry, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I say the following to give notice that this bill, Assembly Bill 123, should be opposed. Assembly Bill 123 violates the parental rights of American citizens. It also violates a child's rights, and it is discriminatory. Let it be known that I have chosen to give this notice as a proud, naturalized American. This bill violates the Fourth Amendment rights, which states, "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures." The Fourth Amendment extends this with *Katz v. United States*, 389 U.S. 347 (1967). The Supreme Court held that its protections extend to intrusions on the privacy of individuals as well as to physical locations.

This database requirement is government overreach and violates our constitutional rights. The misdemeanor clause is an egregious display of coercion and is discrimination of a minority group. As a person of color, I know from my own experience how discriminatory laws lead to abuse and mistreatment. The potential of a database breach exposing our children's protected health information is a grave probability. Our federal government cannot even protect their classified information from other nations. If our federal government cannot keep the Secretary of State's emails out of the hands of the Russians, upon what precedent should parents of Nevada trust a local government to protect their child's private health information?

In being forced to share health information with agencies outside the school and nurse, a breach can harm a child. Under the current law, a child has the right to be protected from having their location disclosed. A location breach harms children in protected domestic situations. Statistically and historically, the majority of those affected by this would be among the minority population.

If you are a Republican, you should oppose this bill because you are for limited government, and this bill will increase government. If you are a Democrat, you should oppose it because it will discriminate and disenfranchise people. If you are a Libertarian, you should oppose it because it violates the authority and custody of a parent over a child, which is a violation of liberty and your party states it seeks a world of liberty.

In summary, this bill violates Americans' Fourth Amendment rights, increases government overreach, is discriminatory to a minority group, and it violates liberty. I do not consent to this bill. Oppose the bill.

**Denise Mraz, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I would like to address the Department of Health and Human Services and Assemblywoman Munk's assertion that the measles outbreak was the number they reported. Follow-up information indicated about one-third of those cases were actually just a rash from the vaccine itself. Additionally, I am floored that a health professional like Assemblywoman Munk would even consider bringing this bill as one of her ten bills because a \$1 billion lawsuit was just introduced two days ago in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York for an egregious situation where 500 people were actually infected by vaccines. We know, based on the last three months, there has been a rolling schedule of weekly exposures or corruption of what is actually in the vaccines, and that is exposing the fact that they are promoted antigens such as the measles antigen. The good stuff is not even in the vaccine. Not only are you making the assumption that the vaccines are safe, which they are not and we know that, but essentially this mandate is promoting vaccines, which is a marketing game.

I also want to say as far as the 300 man-hours of advising people about outbreaks, et cetera, what I suggest is you just put it all in a text message. If there is a measles outbreak, the entire district should get a text message of where it is. That takes about five minutes and would certainly cut time.

Additionally, this bill does violate HIPAA. It is an unfunded mandate on families, which is unconstitutional, and it does divert money away from academic prowess, which is the only job of the education committees.

**Wiz Rouzard, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am a father in Las Vegas to a beautiful two-year-old boy. Personally, since I saw this bill, I have not slept. For this to come out of Assembly District No. 4 and Assemblywoman Munk just blew my mind. When I read line 6 of the Legislative Counsel's Digest for the bill, she said it does not require it. My question is, If it is not required, why does line 6 say, "the religious belief of the parent or guardian prohibits the immunization of the child; or"? That word "or" is very important. That differentiates whether or not it is a choice or if it is a mandate. The word "and" is used on page 3 of the bill, line 32. It means that in order for this to be considered and qualified, a subsequent document or signature has to be signed.

You asked a very important question, Assemblyman Thompson, and I am glad you did because that is what kept me up at night. As a loving father, one thing I vowed is to protect my son. The question is, who comes knocking? Not one person here has been able to answer that question. Let me tell you who comes knocking. I had a traffic ticket three weeks ago that went into a warrant that I was unaware of. Do you know who came knocking? It was the police with a gun. When it comes to a neglected child, and if the school deems that child to be neglected because of a behavior of the parent that the state does not agree



with, which is what A.B. 123 does, who comes knocking is a cop. Freedom is taken by the pen first, secondly by the bullet. This act here today, the very fact that it came to mind, is an attack on me as a father. The line was drawn a long time ago before my son was born. That is my son to protect. I will protect him by any means necessary. If this bill is to pass, I will say that each and every person who has supported this bill has not heard the last of it.

**Cindy Lake, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

If this bill is so friendly, I say, along with Mr. Rouzard, add another section that will require immediate criminal charges to all legislators who vote in support of this bill. I heard Assemblywoman Munk say she is here as a "survivor." I am here as a survivor of measles, mumps, rubella, and chicken pox. I am a mother of four and a grandmother of two. I, too, come here in opposition of this bill. I am shocked to hear Assemblywoman Munk in support of this bill in any way, shape, or form as a cancer survivor.

**Chairman Thompson:**

Can you please speak to the bill and not to the bill sponsor? [Ms. Lake continued talking.] Can the control room please shut off the microphone, as she is being very disrespectful? The next person who is opposed to this bill may now speak.

**Linda Cundiff, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada:**

I am a proud mother of a four-year-old daughter. I was born and raised in Nevada. I come to you today because a bill has come up in the Legislature by the name of A.B. 123. After reading over this bill, I am highly opposed to it. It violates a parent's right of religion by asking us to make the choice between our faith and waiving our privacy rights. This is coercion and discriminatory against those of us using a religious exemption. Having to submit names to the health department and numerous unnamed agencies is putting our children's lives at risk of being harassed and bullied, not only by numerous peers, but also by adults. It is an extreme form of coercion to ask us to choose between our faith and privacy that has been a tenet of this country since its inception. The Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) of 1974 protects the rights of our children, while still allowing proper protection of individuals in case of outbreaks. There is no need to ask us to waive FERPA rights in exchange for our religious beliefs.

We were not born in a country based on socialism or persecution. We were born in this country to be given the right to say what goes in our bodies and the freedom to have our privacy protected. This bill violates our freedom, privacy, and the right to practice our religion without fear of persecution or discrimination. This is America—the country of freedom.

**Katania Taylor, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

I am a mother in Reno, Nevada, as well as an acupuncturist. I want to point out I do have a chart I submitted ([Exhibit S](#)). I want to make the point that A.B. 123 is very redundant. Our current state statutes and Family Education Rights of Privacy Act of 1974 already cover the requirements asked for by this bill, and they are actually quite well written. If the current

law is not working as intended, then schools obviously need better funding, support, communication, and training. A new, more complicated bill is really not the answer.

I am hearing a lot of issues from many of the agencies that are in support of this bill, which sounds a lot like funding issues. It does not sound to me like this law needs to be rewritten. The Family Education Rights of Privacy Act has been mentioned quite a bit, and it does provide a double redundancy. Our state statutes and FERPA cover for outbreaks and protect our children's privacy at the same time as protecting people from the outbreak. Assembly Bill 123 asks parents to sign away their protection provided by FERPA. It asks parents to waive the rights of their children to privacy of all school records in exchange for their right to practice religion or protect their children as they see fit from further physical damage or possibly even death. No amount of softening of the repercussions of this bill takes away the fact that parents are asked to sign away the rights to privacy that sets them up for discrimination and harassment for an undetermined amount of time, and possibly even a lifetime.

This is the most coercive, egregious request a government could make of a citizen. This country is founded on our belief that we have a right to religious freedom and protection from persecution. We have put laws in place to guarantee these freedoms and protect our privacy. These laws also already breach a certain amount of privacy in case of outbreaks to protect others. Please do not ask parents to make this impossible choice. It harkens back to days when groups of people were beginning to be marginalized, required to register, and soon required to wear an emblem on their coat while in public. Please let the current law work its magic because it is well written. The schools are overburdened and need to be funded. [Written testimony ([Exhibit T](#)) was also submitted.]

**Jami Hepworth, Private Citizen, Gardnerville, Nevada:**

I am a product of Nevada's public schools. I received my bachelor of arts in German literature at Brigham Young University. My husband is a family physician and is now practicing as a hospitalist in Nevada. We are happy to be here with our four kids.

I want to give a perspective as a doctor's wife that you might not hear very often. I am an ex-vaxxer and I came into this unwillingly. I did not ever realize that vaccines were something that I should question. It was brought to my attention that some vaccines are actually created with the use of aborted fetuses that were healthy, and they culture these cell lines and these cell lines over time wane and they have to get new cell lines. As a pro-life person, I did not want to accept this into my family's bodies. To me, it was an example of medical cannibalism. I went to my pediatrician and talked to him about it. I asked if he could please help me to find an animal-based alternative. I had researched and found some in Sweden and Japan. I wanted to have something different. He had never heard of the fact that these human cell lines were in vaccines. He was very confused. I directed him to the CDC website to show him.

I started talking to other physicians in my husband's residency program, and I found over and over again that they could not answer my questions. It started out as a religious concern, but it became a medical concern. They did not know that vaccines are not properly studied with saline placebos. They did not know that the aluminum adjuvant is now, with new research, being connected to a whole host of autoimmune conditions and other disorders. There is a zinc adjuvant quietly being looked at to replace the aluminum adjuvant.

This is an egregious overreach of state and federal power, and I oppose this bill.

**Bret Corbett, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:**

I am a chiropractor here in Carson City, Nevada. I have extensively researched vaccines. I oppose this bill. It is discrimination because you are looking at the minority, and not everyone, with these records. Once again, it is redundant to the laws that are already there. When you have a list like this, it sets up the minority of children for harassment. In my research, I have found that most of the statistics show the kids who get the vaccine are the ones that get the disease. They are all worried about protecting those. If the vaccine truly protected those kids, what would they be worried about with the other kids in the room? It does not make any sense. If they are truly protected by the vaccine, then they should not be worried about the other children. They always say it is the unvaccinated, but there is no data that shows that.

The part of the bill that really alarms me is the "neglected" child. Those who talked in favor of the bill were organizations. You notice it is the parents who are concerned. I am the father of two. When they say they are looking at removing it, that is very vague. There is nothing saying they are removing it. Once again, I oppose the bill.

**Brittany Sheehan, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

Today I will not discuss where privacy rights are derived from. The bill, as proposed, demonstrates an understanding that religious and medical information are indeed protected by constitutional law. The issue is that such a right is understood here, yet not respected. The standard for a compelling state interest is far from satisfied. There is no specified purpose for obtaining this information in a coercive manner, under duress and threat of criminal penalty. We have no idea how far the private information goes or what they do with it. The only governmental interest served, at best, is mere preference or curiosity. By this standard, we cannot condone the religious beliefs and medical conditions of minor children be distributed along with their names and location.

While the author tells us this protects unvaccinated children, it in no way can be demonstrated to do so. The ambiguity fosters opportunity for gross abuse and targeting of specific populations, all while criminalizing the assertion of fundamental rights. There is no reason to submit religious information on an annual basis. Of course, we do not put children's names on lists with their religious beliefs to be distributed without any stated purpose. I urge you to ask yourselves in what society have we done so outside of 1940s Germany.

This bill states that if a child is denied access to school by the state, the parents are deemed criminally negligent. This on its face is absurd as the action of seeking access and inclusion for the child as demonstrated by the parent is anything but negligence.

I ask members of the Committee to oppose coercive tactics that compromise fundamental rights of children and criminalize parents. This bill has no merit and is a detriment to the children it inevitably targets. Even for currently vaccinating parents, in the future there may be a vaccine they do not believe in a child receiving. When that day comes, it will be your child's name and information being leveraged. I ask the Committee to choose a culture of transparency for parents and respect for fundamental privacy of minor children.

**Cyrus Hojjaty, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I want to point out that Assemblywoman Munk is proposing this bill. A couple of weeks ago at a town hall at Centennial High School, I told her that I do not want my state to be like California. She was acting like she had no idea what I was talking about. Guess what? This bill proposal is law in the state of California. I think she does know what I am talking about; she is just trying to run away from me.

**Chairman Thompson:**

Could you please speak to the bill, sir?

**Cyrus Hojjaty:**

I was from California and we had to deal with all this nonsense. I do not want to be forced. I am not a public school student. If I were to have children, I do not want them to be forced to be vaccinated. I do not. From what I have seen, this bill covers children who are even homeschooled. We have the freedom to pull our children out from a system that does not correlate with our beliefs. I do not see how this bill relates to that. This is clearly unconstitutional. If I were to have children, I would look at homeschooling, but this bill does not look like it reflects my voice. Believe it or not, I think it is probably better that we should look at what is causing our health problems, like the long commutes, the poor food we eat, the diseases coming from abroad. We should look at the root cause of our health problems rather than just forcing to vaccinate them. This is one of the reasons why I am very skeptical of having government provide us services like public education. I would like you all to put your hands up and show if you are taking campaign contributions from pharmaceutical industries.

**Chairman Thompson:**

Thank you for your time. You are moving off of the subject. [Mr. Hojjaty continued to speak.] Could we please cut the microphone and move on to the next person?

I did not think I was going to have to reiterate the decorum for this Committee. We are all passionate about education. We love our children. However, we will stick with the bill. If you go beyond the scope of the bill, your time is up.

**Daphne Lee, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am a lifetime Nevadan. I am also a University of Nevada, Las Vegas alum with a bachelor's degree in biological sciences, and I am a mother of three. I am here today because I am deeply disturbed by the language I have read in A.B. 123.

I am very concerned that this bill essentially creates a religious registry with government bureaucracies, violates patient/doctor privacy, and exposes minor students' records. I was a little confused in the commentary earlier with the great questions that were being asked. If they are going to amend the bill so that children's names are left out, then what is the point of the bill? You are trying to identify people.

The First Amendment guarantees and protects religion as one of the founding principles in this nation with historical references to guide us. I would hope that any such registry, regardless of reasoning, would be deeply frowned on. It sounds like these will also require approval now, which I did not see in the bill, and no details on how that is going to be determined. We have seen religious testing come after bills like these. I cannot even fathom what religious testing from a school district would look like.

On a fiscal note, I can imagine this bill detracts valuable tax dollars in order to implement this system that could be put to better use. I was speaking to a friend of mine this weekend who is a teacher here in town. She is deeply concerned she may have to retire this year because they are overwhelmed with children who have special needs and who are sick. She even carries an EpiPen [epinephrine injection] with her.

This bill also sets up even more unnecessary burdens to the medical exemption community, but it also exposes doctors, as we have seen in California and other states that have imposed these types of regulations. They target doctors after this. They go after them and report them to the board. They take away their licenses. My daughter is thinking about going to medical school. Do you know how terrifying that is to me? If she wanted to suggest to her patient a different course of action, her medical license could be revoked or she could be put on probation. It is intimidating doctors all over the country. I oppose this bill. Thank you for your time and the thoughtful questions.

**Tasha Heath, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I would like to ask all of you if you are updated on your booster shots because most adults are not. I highly doubt most of you are. I hope you have had all your boosters since you are purporting that we all vaccinate our children. I honestly pray that all the parents of Nevada just pull their kids out of school and start homeschooling. We already have a huge number of homeschooled children in this state because of our poor education system. This will totally add upon that, but at least it will take away some of the money out of the greedy pockets of government.

Chronic disease and childhood obesity are caused from vaccines. Allergies, asthma, and autoimmune disorders are all known side effects of vaccines. You will make it impossible for doctors to agree with these exemptions because they will be afraid of repercussions causing their license to be suspended. Vaccinated people are not immune from the disease and often, when further investigated, it almost always turns out to be a vaccinated child shedding the disease and causing the outbreak. You cannot cause an outbreak for a disease you do not have. Once you go the safe route for preventing outbreaks, then go in the extreme opposite direction. Keep the vaccinated kids home 28 days because per the neonatal intensive care unit, vaccines can shed up to 28 days. Where are the standards asking these children to stay home? Good intentions pave the road to hell.

**Christina Lovato, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

Over the weekend, my son hit two home runs, hit a triple, and had four runs batted in. That is an example of information that is okay to share. I am a native of Las Vegas, a mother of five, a grandmother of one, and a coach to numerous young girls in our community. Working with patients for over 20 years has taught me that some things are to remain strictly confidential. This helps create a trusting relationship between the patient and health care providers.

I spent some time carefully reading A.B. 123, and subsequently, this left me with many concerns over the release of the vaccine records, which again, should remain private. The disclosure of a record about an individual from a system of records is prohibited by FERPA. Vaccinations are indeed a part of a medical record. Vaccinations are controversial topics, putting health care providers, teachers, and most importantly, our children in unnecessary, vulnerable positions.

My teenage daughter was recently caught in an intense conversation with her girlfriends regarding the HPV [human papillomavirus] vaccine. Many of the girls felt that disclosing their personal vaccination history would send wrong messages to their young male peers. An example of a question that developed was, "If you are not sexually active with multiple partners, then why do you need the HPV vaccine?" Our younger children, who are in advanced honors classes, participate in soccer, baseball, play musical instruments, and attend church regularly, should feel free to go to school and feel welcomed by all classmates, including children and staff, regardless of our religious beliefs or if they have been vaccinated or not.

Assembly Bill 123 would place our children, not just on a registry, but on a list of children to be harassed. As a mother, grandmother, a coach, and a health care provider, I ask that you protect the privacy of our minor children's medical records, including but not limited to the record of any vaccines given or not given, as well as our religious exemptions. Together with our children, we thank you for your time.

**Kathy Spicuzza, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am a mother of three and a grandmother of one. I am here to talk about the usurpation of religious rights, which is wrongfully seizing by force the unfunded mandate regarding vaccine and reporting bias. This is an unfunded mandate. At no time should law require the expenditure on behalf of a parent or guardian to comply with *Nevada Revised Statutes*. In this case, requiring the purchase of fraudulent gimmicks, which vaccine science has been proven in U.S. District Court, Southern District of New York, Case No. 1:18-CV-031215, November 2018, where the Department of Health and Human Services admitted no vaccines have been safety tested since 1986.

Parental rights for religious exemptions are conscientious objections. We do not seek advice or permission from undertrained staff, nor should we be forced to pay untrained professionals for opinions, also called medical exemptions. Moral beliefs do not require any permissions. My rights are by our Creator for me, the created. I was born with these rights and my duty is to protect the same for my child, regardless of anyone's wrongful laws, edifications, or mandates.

A child's natural-born immunity is their property. It is the proper role of the parent to defend their natural rights to their natural immunity. It is not within the purview, which is the purpose or scope of the statute, for any legislative or governmental body to insist on unfunded mandates that reduce life, liberty, or property of any person. That includes vaccines and proposed notification and permissions regarding the same.

Vaccine damage is real. In 2018 over \$4 billion was paid in vaccination damage claims by big pharmacy, representing just 1 percent of the virus reports to date. In fact, VAERS [Vaccine Adverse Event Report System] reporting is not even covered in medical school. Vaccine training is 1 1/2 days in the total of eight years of medical training. Parents of these vaccine-damaged children have lost countless hours in lost work time, in pursuit of happiness, and impoverishment by medical expense, another consequence of vaccines. I oppose this bill.

**Sara Yelowitz, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

I am a parent. I am asking you to vote against A.B. 123. Nevada already has perfectly fine immunization exemption procedures. Being required to renew exemptions each year would needlessly create a burden of excessive paperwork and cost for both families and school districts.

This bill forces parents to consent to private health information being shared, not only during outbreaks, which is typically done now, but every year with multiple state agencies. This is most certainly a violation of health privacy and a violation of the FERPA rights parents and families are entitled to.

There are already provisions that allow for the sharing of this type of information in specific situations of risk. Forcing parents to waive their FERPA rights using the dual threat of having their children excluded from school and the mention of negligence in the bill is coercion. Thank you, Assemblywoman Krasner, for bringing up the point about neglect. That was a huge part of the bill that stood out to me when I read it.

I have also looked at the proposed amendment to this bill which was submitted by Immunize Nevada ([Exhibit E](#)). I am also opposed to the proposed amendment. The amendment they are suggesting would additionally require religious exemptions to be resubmitted annually, which I do not believe is necessary. It asks for the medical practitioner's license number to be included on the medical exemption form. Requiring their license number will likely deter them from writing medical exemptions over concern that they could later be harassed. Not only are you setting up students and families to be harassed, but now you are possibly setting up medical practitioners to be harassed.

The misdemeanor charges and the threat of neglect is crazy. I think that would be a very poor use of our limited resources. Rather than fixing something that is not broken, please focus instead on improving education and addressing the many other actual needs in the Nevada school system.

**Deirdre Mazzetto, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

I am the mother of a child with a permanent medical exemption—permanent by the doctor who signed the exemption—that prohibits vaccination. I am also a master's-educated constituent of Washoe County, and I graduated from the University of Nevada, Reno. I talked with several of your staff yesterday, and I also spoke with Assemblywoman Munk last week about her bill. I strongly oppose this bill and it needs to be dropped for numerous reasons. You can read my written testimony ([Exhibit U](#)) that includes these problems. The problems are bolded if you are short on time.

In addition, there are some new points that have come up today that are essential to share. I am actually okay with information sharing for outbreak purposes, but the information does not need to go the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), which is a federal agency. In addition, it would go to the DHHS first and then the DHHS would send it back to the local agencies during times of outbreak, which does not make any sense. The local agencies and state authorities are the ones who need the information during times of outbreak to exclude those pupils from school.

It is also asking for parents to obtain an annual exemption, which is exceedingly difficult. It is nearly impossible to find a doctor to sign a medical exemption. This is for 0.1 percent of Nevada kindergartners who have medical exemptions. This is per Immunize Nevada data on their own website. This aspect of the bill is not about information sharing at all and is discriminatory against those with exemptions, which is a clear minority of pupils. This is not



about vaccine access, as Immunize Nevada suggests. It is about access to exemptions. We have no access to the exemptions that we need for our children. Assemblywoman Munk's concern is with the school's record-keeping and information distribution. Therefore, she needs to address the school's responsibilities in the bill and not the parents. It is misdirected at the parents.

**Candice Liddell, Private Citizen, Gardnerville, Nevada:**

I am severely vaccine-injured. I have suffered from permanent brain damage and seizures caused by a reaction to the DTaP vaccination. Growing up, the seizures were so severe that in order to have a chance of a halfway normal life, I had to undergo two major brain surgeries, where they had to remove the left temporal lobe of my brain. I still have 15 to 25 focal seizures every month compared to 40 grand mal seizures per month, so it has improved.

Through genetic testing this past year, I learned I do not carry the seizure gene, so my seizures were definitely caused solely by a vaccination. I did learn that I carry the MTHFR [methylenetetrahydrofolate reductase] gene mutation, which affects the body's ability to detox properly when given vaccinations or medications. To receive further vaccines could be deadly for me due to this gene mutation. My daughter also carries the same mutation. For her to be vaccinated would be very dangerous and she would, most likely, have the same or a similar reaction. I cannot and will not take this chance with her.

I am able to get by with a religious exemption at this time, but I am also in the process of obtaining medical exemptions for her for further protection. Obtaining medical exemptions is very expensive, \$700 to \$1,000. This condition will not change and is a permanent defect in our genetic disposition. One size does not fit all.

This bill would infringe on my rights as a parent to protect my daughter from the same fate I have suffered. My daughter is not neglected, she is protected. This bill is a privacy violation and allows for government interference. It is unethical and unconstitutional. Please vote no on this bill.

**Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Families for Freedom:**

I became interested in this issue many years ago when my daughter, after a vaccine, had a femoral seizure and quit breathing. I resuscitated her. Since that time, I have looked into many things about vaccines and later, when I went to get her the polio vaccine, I read the warnings, which indicated if she had had a seizure, she should not have it, and if there was someone living in my home who had cancer, she should not have it. I talked to the people in charge and they would not listen to me. They demanded that I prove there was someone in my home who had cancer, which was my father who had leukemia. We went through a lot of hassle and finally we were able to get an alternative vaccine after they tried to bully me.

It is of great concern because of this that I worked with former Senator Rawson years ago in order to provide for religious and medical exemptions. There is no annual reporting for medical exemptions. It is costly for families to do it, as you heard earlier, and the medical condition most likely has not changed. The purpose of this bill will be harmful to families in that it will decrease their ability for confidentiality. We know if the information goes to all those agencies, there will be no confidentiality. That is a laugh. We also know this sets people up, as it has in other states, for harassment. We want to maintain our religious and medical exemptions because of our precious children. I do not want others to almost lose their daughter like I almost lost mine. If my father had not taught me to do rescue breathing, my daughter would not have made it. I am very thankful for those skills I learned from my father. This is a bill that is unnecessary and we ask you to defeat it.

**Joy Davis, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

I oppose this bill. More importantly, I am Moriah-Beth's mom. She is with us today. She has hydrocephalus. The ventricle in her brain was blocked and fluid built up, causing pressure within the brain. This condition makes her vulnerable to seizures, neurological problems, and motor delays. She cannot be vaccinated. She is also not allowed in a pediatrician's office in the City of Reno. She also has a very difficult time getting a medical exemption. The reason that I was told is because doctors do not want to put their medical license at risk. I have been told this over and over again. I have traveled to California and paid over \$200 for her to be assessed and I got a six-month medical exemption.

My concern with this bill is due to the fact that she has a difficult time getting a medical exemption. She is two years away from school and is in the early intervention program with Nevada. My concern is, she will not be able to get her medical exemption. Six months will not cut it, especially if I have to renew every year. This is a very difficult bill, especially under the threat of being a negligent parent.

When I heard about this bill, I wondered if you knew how difficult it is to even get medical care for a daughter like mine. I have literally called doctor's offices over and over again saying I cannot vaccinate according to the CDC schedule and would like her to just be seen. The family practitioners say they can accept my daughter, but because she is on Medicaid, she has to go to a pediatrician. It is a loop. This limits my daughter's possibilities. She cannot go to school. She cannot go to a pediatrician's office. Please vote no. [Written testimony with supporting documents ([Exhibit V](#)) was also submitted.]

**Lynn Chapman, State Vice President, Nevada Eagle Forum:**

Nevada Eagle Forum is opposed to this bill. My daughter had seizures when she was a baby. Every time she had a vaccination, she had a seizure. Way back in the olden days, I had a tetanus shot and my whole body swelled up. The doctors were afraid my internal organs were swelling as well and could burst and I would die. I have never had another tetanus shot, as the doctor told me never to have another one.

I came across something very interesting. It was an open letter to the Vermont Legislature, dated April 22, 2015. It was from Dr. Tetyana Obukhanych ([Exhibit K](#)). She has a Ph.D. in immunology. She wrote ". . . the 2013 meeting of the Board of Scientific Counselors at the CDC revealed additional alarming data that pertussis variants (PRN-negative strains) currently circulating the USA acquired a selective advantage to infect those who are up-to-date for the DTaP boosters, meaning that people who are up-to-date are more likely to be infected, and thus contagious, than people who are not vaccinated." She has very long testimony, which I am not going to read. She wrote, "In summary, a person who is not vaccinated with IPV, DTaP, HepB, and Hib vaccines due to reasons of conscience poses no extra danger to the public than a person who is." She also said a recent study done in Ontario, Canada, established that vaccinations actually lead to an emergency room visit more often than not from children who are vaccinated. We are opposed.

**Diane Bishop, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am a mom and a grandmother. I spent 30 years in early childhood education seeing what has happened since vaccine companies were given carte blanche. We are one nation under God, and yet our right to religious liberty is in danger. Bills in several states now seek to totally remove religious exemption for vaccinations. This has been done in California, West Virginia, and Mississippi. Tyranny encroaches.

Based on what is happening in other states, one cannot help but wonder if the proposed legislation to share names with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) is part of a process to have DHHS begin judging with their own criteria the religious sincerity of parents having or requesting religious exemptions. I oppose the bill for this reason. If this happens, would religious exemption be granted based on the belief that the vaccine program, as it is, is evil and not acceptable to God because the program is deceptive, experimental, laced with verifiable unchecked political, medical and scientific fraud, and it requires unnecessary medical procedures with risks leading to verifiable harm and death to many, and potential harm to one's own child? Vaccines rob us of God-given immunity. To invalidate such claims as untrue, strictly medical, and not religious in nature would be ludicrous.

To require that the questionable science of vaccine manufacturers and the CDC must be accepted as good and necessary at face value is to ask someone to deny their God-given intelligence and their God-given responsibility to protect life. The precise nature of the foundation of one's religious beliefs is irrelevant. Religion compels us to seek truth and justice, to guide us in knowing right from wrong in the eyes of God. Religion exists to guide us in all aspects in life to protect life.

**Sarah McDuffie, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I had not planned to talk today, but after hearing everything, I had to get up. I am a mother of seven children, ages 22, 19, 13, 11, 8, and twin 6-year-olds. I might not have some fancy degree; I do not have one of those cute badges like some of the other ladies have, but my degree is in my children. I am an expert. I am also a Christian and a believer in God and our Savior Jesus Christ. I will not shoot up my children with aborted baby cells. I believe in life and the value of life. It is vehemently against my husband's and my religious belief.

You are throwing the words "neglect" and "misdemeanor" around and trying to put my very healthy children on a list to be discriminated against. They have a right to education. Assembly Bill 123 is absolutely unconstitutional. You are violating my children's right to privacy with this bill, as well as my religious freedom.

How is disease spread? You have to have a disease to spread it. This dialogue is making assumptions that those unvaccinated are the ones spreading the diseases. Being proactive, like Assemblywoman Munk and her pro-vaccine colleagues state, how about we start by teaching all the children, not just unvaccinated, but all the children how to have proper hygiene, eat healthy, and properly clean the school surfaces? How about kids who just had vaccines and are shedding or children who are visibly sick stay home? With the utmost respect, I pray that you strike down this horrible infringement on children's privacy. It is redundant, pricey, and unnecessary. I oppose A.B. 123 as a pro-life Christian, as a mother, and as a proud American.

**T. Matthew Phillips, Private Citizen, North Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am here today on behalf of the Vaccine Abolition Society. I am a licensed attorney, 25 years at the bar. I have heard a lot of talk today about how this is not about vaccines, but it is a slippery slope. We saw what happened in California. I know it happened in California because I sued the state of California and was in litigation with them for about two years. What I have seen in the course of that with government overreach in vaccines is shocking and has committed me to oppose overreaching bills like this. Remember, if you are injured by a vaccine, you cannot sue. There is no recourse. If your child dies in an SUV rollover, you can sue Ford or Chevy, but if your child dies in a vaccine rollover, you cannot sue. The reason is because in 2011, the United States Supreme Court said all vaccines are unavoidably unsafe. If we turn the personal injury bar loose on the vaccine makers, they would capsize that ship in about six months.

I am now in litigation with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Why? To try to get them to do vaccine safety reporting that they have not done in 33 years. The next time the federal government tells you that vaccines are safe and effective, ask them based on what, because they have not done any kind of safety reporting whatsoever. The Washington measles outbreak is a hoax. I heard people talk about the booster shots. That is an indictment of the predicate vaccine.

I have to say that I am truly inspired by the people who have spoken before me today. I have had a chance to look at the bill and after a cursory review, it violates privacy, the Fifth Amendment right to parent, it is vague and ambiguous, and it also violates the Fourteenth Amendment. Everyone who signed the sign-in sheet is opposed to this bill. I tell you now, if you pass this law, I will sue you.

**Chairman Thompson:**

We are allowing everyone to give their point of view. We need to stick to the bill and we will not attack anyone in this committee room. Sir, if you would please leave your seat and allow the next person to sit there, we would appreciate it.

**Carla Shiel, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

My daughter, Zara Shiel, was born on July 26, 2013. She was our third child, born healthy, and had a 15-month trackable health record. On November 18, 2014, she went to her well visit and received seven total vaccines and died less than 24 hours later. Her autopsy report showed the cause of death as undetermined, with clear findings of brain edema, which are consistent with vaccine injury. Through the Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System, I learned two other babies with the same lot numbers died within two months of Zara. Imagine all that have not been reported.

We have been in vaccine court for four years now. The latest update from the court was on October 4, 2017. I quote that the special master will hold a hearing in this case. However, due to the volume of cases that are ready for entitlement hearings, the special master will not begin looking at dates until next year.

Vaccine injury is real. Death is real. We have no way of knowing if our two other children are predisposed to have negative effects, including death from vaccines. I oppose this bill and ditto to everyone who spoke before me opposing this bill.

**Taree Waterman, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am the mom to a little boy named Anderson who, when I took him in to his pediatrician at 10 weeks old, received eight vaccinations listed on the CDC vaccine schedule. That same night, he passed away. We miss him every day, and that is why I am here. I have three living boys who are healthy and full of life. I am here to protect their right to medical privacy. I am here to oppose A.B. 123.

Each of my living children have medical exemptions. What this bill is proposing is not only a medical exemption, but the need to sign over their privacy. How would you justify a child being neglected by parents simply not wanting to sign a form releasing their private medical information? They already have their doctor's signature stating they cannot be vaccinated. The system is not broken, so why fix it? As others have said, FERPA already had a plan in place for every student in the event of a health threat. Why should my children be singled out and have to jump through very intrusive hoops just because they cannot be vaccinated? You are walking the line of discrimination. This also opens the doors to harassment for their entire school career. We should not be forced to inform anyone else of our children's medical information. I would be coerced into signing a form releasing my children's private medical information that I do not want to sign because I fear being slapped with a misdemeanor and my children being deemed neglected. Refusing to sign the form would not negate the fact that my children still have a medical exemption. There are plenty of other things that can be fixed in our school system, but this is not one of them.

**Kristen Krusyna, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I oppose this bill for all the reasons stated before me. I would like to reiterate a couple of things. I do have concerns over standardized forms for medical and religious exemptions because I do not know what the wording would involve and I do not know if I would have a say in what those state. I think it is a slippery slope of what I am signing. I am wondering

if I could have a say on that. I am also concerned about doctors having to give their license number on the amendment that Immunize Nevada submitted ([Exhibit E](#)). A lot of doctors are already very hesitant to even give out medical exemptions and if they have to do that, I do not feel that is going to help in any way. It is very difficult for parents.

For a lot of people with unvaccinated children, it is becoming increasingly difficult to find a pediatrician in Las Vegas who will even allow you to see him. You are narrowing it down on how parents can get exemptions to go to school.

I share the Chairman's concerns about excluding children for not submitting the form. As Ms. Waterman stated, her children have medical exemptions, but if she did not complete the form, her kids could not go to school. They have the exemptions, but because she will not sign away the privacy is a concern.

I am also concerned about Immunize Nevada's vague wording on their amendment ([Exhibit E](#)). A "de-identified list" leaves room for a little bit of leeway and I am concerned about that. It also says the local health officer can release information to a list of agencies in case of an outbreak. It is very vague and leaves room for exploitation. Those are my concerns, so I oppose this bill.

**Nicole Stoke, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am a mother of five. I am here today to express my strong opposition to A.B. 123. One of my biggest concerns is the massive violation of privacy and FERPA laws in this bill. This has the ability to track children and expand state involvement where it is not necessary. Our exemption laws are functioning fine as they are. In this day and age of doxing, hacking, and online harassment, the less people who have access to a minor's private medical information the better. The Infinite Campus portal is not immune to hackers, and this is of great concern to me.

Turning personally identifiable information over to unnamed bureaucrats not involved in my child's life is a heinous overreach of the state. I see this as harassment and discrimination against a minority group. This opens my children up to potential lifelong tracking in a database, and it goes against everything this country was founded on. I also see this as harassment of me exercising my constitutionally protected freedom of religion.

This bill is also redundant in many ways, as non-vaccinated children are already excluded during outbreaks. There is literally no reason to burden schools with this, as the focus should be education, not bureaucratic paperwork. What types of funds or budget would this require? Nevada is barely getting our kids reading. Why are we focusing on a nonissue and making it one?

This bill and Immunize Nevada's amendment ([Exhibit E](#)) are trying to fracture the doctor-patient relationship with continual yearly renewal of medical exemptions. The demand that doctors give their license number could open doctors up to potential state harassment and cause an undue burden and financial stress on parents with medically fragile children.

My own brother was injured from the DTaP vaccine in 1992 when he suffered a shot collapse reaction with aspirational pneumonia as a result of this vaccine. I was 12 years old and I witnessed it. I do not consent to this bill and I urge you to vote no.

**Elizabeth Reza, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am here as a parent of two daughters who are in elementary school. One of my daughters carries an EpiPen for her dairy allergy and egg allergy. I do not think this is a proper bill to be implementing right now in the school. As it is, they do not even understand the current laws. I had a big issue putting in my exemption at my daughter's elementary school. I had issues with the school staff and the school nurse. I went to the school district nurse. She was not even aware of my rights and made it very difficult for me. We ultimately had to file a complaint against the district. We finally got through to the assistant superintendent.

The bill is going to make things more complicated and more burdensome to the school. When I turned in my exemption, it was not on a sticky note, it was typed properly with the proper signatures, but I was still having issues. This is literally harassment and bullying. We are in the minority according to Immunize Nevada with 0.1 percent of Nevadans with medical exemptions and 3.1 percent with religious exemptions. There is no reason to point us out and make it easier for everyone else to harass us. I oppose A.B. 123.

**Romina Lizaso, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am the mother of three children, who are all with me. I have two kind ladies holding my other two babies, as we have been patiently waiting to speak for over two hours. In an effort to not sound redundant after all the parents who have spoken before me, I would like to say I am in opposition of A.B. 123. The repetitive revision of this bill only criminalizes parents for not complying with the submitting of additional paperwork for a law that is already in place. I understand that the amendment would not criminalize parents, but that also adds to the redundancy of the bill. I do have questions about what the "de-identified" vagueness would entail.

The bill and the sharing of private information places my children in a vulnerable position, open to discrimination at all times if the agencies and people who have access to it hold differing medical, religious, or overall personal beliefs and opinions. That would be throughout their entire school career. I actually hope I am not found in neglect since I had to pull my oldest child from school in order to be here today. The additional paperwork, time, and fiscal burden this will place on schools and parents is disruptive, excessive, and a direct misuse of taxpayer dollars, as again, we already have a less personally invasive law that

supplies sufficient information to the necessary agencies without putting at risk the privacy of children and families. As someone in Carson City stated, there is no reason to send information to U.S. DHHS before notifying local authorities. I am in opposition of A.B. 123.

**Justine Nikoleit, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I identify as a Constitutionalist. A Constitutionalist is an individual who believes and supports the legal foundation of the *U.S. Constitution* and its amendments. Therefore, I am vehemently opposed to this bill.

**Chairman Thompson:**

Is there anyone else wishing to testify in opposition to the bill? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to testify in neutral to the bill, either in Las Vegas or Carson City?

**Timothy Burch, Administrator, Human Services, Department of Social Service and Family Services, Clark County:**

As referenced previously by the bill's sponsor, Clark County has submitted an amendment ([Exhibit F](#)) in regard to language found on page 4, lines 23-25, and page 5, lines 40-42 of the bill, which are in direct opposition with *Nevada Revised Statutes* 432B.260, subsections 2 and 6, that require the child welfare agency to conduct an investigation prior to determining neglect. We would be happy to work with the bill sponsor and the members of the Committee to see that language changed.

**Chairman Thompson:**

Assemblywoman Munk, would you like to give a closing statement?

**Assemblywoman Munk:**

In closing, as I mentioned earlier, immunizations have a profound effect curtailing often deadly diseases in our society. Improving those rates in our schools, preventing the occurrences of these diseases, and protecting those children who cannot be vaccinated is our duty and our objective. We are not alone in this endeavor. You will find in the exhibits a selection of contributing articles from well-known institutions, such as the American Academy of Pediatrics and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Today we have heard the opponents of A.B. 123 say it is another attempt by the government to collect data on its citizens. Others say the bill restricts their freedom. Others say it is redundant and repetitive. I fully realize the gravity of these objections, and I am willing to work with any of you who have reasonable arguments. As I stated before, we have two amendments that we are working on with our stakeholders, and they are friendly amendments.

I believe we must do a better job in protecting our schools, preventing diseases from happening or spreading, and especially in assisting those children who cannot receive vaccinations because of medical reasons or religious beliefs. This is a discussion we must have now. Even those who disagree with this bill surely want their kids to be healthy and able to learn in a safe environment.



I urge you to support A.B. 123 for the sake of our children. I reiterate that this bill does not require parents to vaccinate their children. The bill does improve the response time in case of a vaccine-preventable disease outbreak from the Nevada school districts and to the public health representatives.

**Chairman Thompson:**

I will close the hearing for Assembly Bill 123. We appreciate everyone who stayed to give their testimony, whether in support, opposition, or neutral. At this time, we will open public comment. We will not be testifying to the bill, but if anyone is here for public comment, please come forward. [There was no one.] If you want to work with the bill sponsor, Assemblywoman Munk is open to work with you. As legislators, we want to work to make the bills the best we can. Please feel free to reach out to the bill sponsor.

[Exhibits submitted but not discussed are ([Exhibit W](#)), ([Exhibit X](#)), ([Exhibit Y](#)), ([Exhibit Z](#)), ([Exhibit AA](#)), ([Exhibit BB](#)), ([Exhibit CC](#)), ([Exhibit DD](#)), ([Exhibit EE](#)), ([Exhibit FF](#)), ([Exhibit GG](#)), ([Exhibit HH](#)), ([Exhibit II](#))].

This meeting is adjourned [at 3:35 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Sharon McCallen  
Recording Secretary

---

Lori McCleary  
Transcribing Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson, Chairman

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

## EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is written testimony and supporting documents presented by Heidi S. Parker, Executive Director, Immunize Nevada, regarding Assembly Bill 123.

[Exhibit D](#) is a document titled "Assembly Bill 123—Section by Section," submitted by Assemblywoman Connie Munk, Assembly District No. 4.

[Exhibit E](#) is a proposed amendment to Assembly Bill 123, submitted by Heidi S. Parker, Executive Director, Immunize Nevada.

[Exhibit F](#) is a proposed amendment to Assembly Bill 123, submitted by John Fudenberg, Coroner, Government Affairs, Office of the Coroner/Medical Examiner, Clark County.

[Exhibit G](#) is a letter dated February 15, 2019, to Chairman Thompson and members of the Assembly Committee on Education, authored by Steve Kutz, Director, Community and Clinical Health Services Division, Washoe County Health District, in support of Assembly Bill 123.

[Exhibit H](#) is a letter dated February 19, 2019, to the Assembly Committee on Education, submitted by Natha C. Anderson, President, Washoe Education Association; and representing Nevada State Education Association, in support of Assembly Bill 123.

[Exhibit I](#) is written testimony authored by Joe Iser, Chief Health Officer, Southern Nevada Health District, in support of Assembly Bill 123.

[Exhibit J](#) is a letter dated February 19, 2019, to the Assembly Committee on Education, authored by Nancy Jones, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada, opposing Assembly Bill 123.

[Exhibit K](#) is a document titled "An Open Letter to Legislators Currently Considering Vaccine Legislation from Tetyana Obukhanych, PhD," submitted by Nancy Jones, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada.

[Exhibit L](#) is a document titled "M-M-R II (Measles, Mumps, and Rubella Virus Vaccine Live," submitted by Nancy Jones, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada.

[Exhibit M](#) is a document titled "Poliovirus Vaccine Inactivated, IPOL," submitted by Nancy Jones, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada.

[Exhibit N](#) is a document titled "Highlights of Prescribing Information: Adacel," submitted by Nancy Jones, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada.

[Exhibit O](#) is a document titled "Supreme Court of the United States Syllabus: Bruesewitz et al. v. Wyeth LLC, FKA Wyeth, Inc., et al.," submitted by Nancy Jones, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada.

[Exhibit P](#) is a document titled "Highlights of Prescribing Information: Prevnar 13," submitted by Nancy Jones, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada.

[Exhibit Q](#) is a document regarding the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, submitted by Nancy Jones, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada.

[Exhibit R](#) is a document titled "Highlights of Prescribing Information: Recombivax HB," submitted by Nancy Jones, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada.

[Exhibit S](#) is a chart submitted by Katania Taylor, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada, regarding Assembly Bill 123.

[Exhibit T](#) is written testimony authored by Katania Taylor, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada, opposing Assembly Bill 123.

[Exhibit U](#) is written testimony authored by Deirdre Mazzetto, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada, opposing Assembly Bill 123.

[Exhibit V](#) is a letter dated February 17, 2019, to the members of the Assembly Committee on Education, authored by Joy Davis, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada, and supporting documents opposing Assembly Bill 123.

[Exhibit W](#) is a document titled "[Assembly Bill 123](#): Selected Articles and Policy Statements," dated February 19, 2019, submitted by Assemblywoman Connie Munk, Assembly District No. 4.

[Exhibit X](#) is a letter dated February 18, 2019, to Assemblywoman Connie Munk, authored by Carrie Hogan, Private Citizen.

[Exhibit Y](#) is a document titled "Summary of issues with AB123," dated February 17, 2019, authored by Dawn Winkler, Private Citizen.

[Exhibit Z](#) is a document titled "What is Child Protective Services (CPS)," submitted by Dawn Winkler, Private Citizen.

[Exhibit AA](#) is a letter dated February 18, 2019, to members of the Assembly Committee on Education, authored by Dawn Winkler, Private Citizen, opposing Assembly Bill 123.

[Exhibit BB](#) is a letter dated February 18, 2019, to Chairman Thompson and members of the Assembly Committee on Education, authored by Sandra Dabney, Private Citizen, and submitted by Sandra Wciorka, Private Citizen, opposing [Assembly Bill 123](#).

[Exhibit CC](#) is a letter dated February 18, 2019, to the Assembly Committee on Education, authored by Maureen Vigneault, Private Citizen, opposing [Assembly Bill 123](#).

[Exhibit DD](#) is written testimony authored by Kristen Gooch, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada, opposing [Assembly Bill 123](#).

[Exhibit EE](#) is a letter dated February 18, 2019, authored by Antonija Krezo, Private Citizen, opposing [Assembly Bill 123](#).

[Exhibit FF](#) is a letter dated February 18, 2019, to the Assembly Committee on Education, authored by Heidi Saucedo, Private Citizen, opposing [Assembly Bill 123](#).

[Exhibit GG](#) is a letter dated February 18, 2019, to Assemblywoman Munk, authored by Ray Somosot, Las Vegas, Nevada, opposing [Assembly Bill 123](#).

[Exhibit HH](#) is a letter dated February 18, 2019, to Assemblywoman Munk, authored by Jennifer Tweedy, Private Citizen, opposing [Assembly Bill 123](#).

[Exhibit II](#) is a document titled "Oppose AB123," submitted by Marisa Brager, Private Citizen.