

Taneeka Hansen

From: Rep. Paul Seaton
Sent: Sunday, April 03, 2016 7:51 PM
To: Taneeka Hansen
Subject: FW: SB 89

From: Bruth George [mailto:bruthg5@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, April 03, 2016 9:30 AM
To: Rep. Paul Seaton <Rep.Paul.Seaton@akleg.gov>; Rep. Adam Wool <Rep.Adam.Wool@akleg.gov>
Subject: SB 89

Dear Legislators:

I am opposed to the passage of this bill which restricts vital education for our vulnerable teenagers.

Bruth George
Fairbanks

Taneeka Hansen

From: Rep. Paul Seaton
Sent: Sunday, April 03, 2016 7:48 PM
To: Taneeka Hansen
Subject: FW: Please Oppose S.B. 89

From: Amy Cross [mailto:aecross4@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, April 03, 2016 6:13 PM
To: Rep. Paul Seaton <Rep.Paul.Seaton@akleg.gov>; Rep. Liz Vazquez <Rep.Liz.Vazquez@akleg.gov>; Rep. Neal Foster <Rep.Neal.Foster@akleg.gov>; Rep. Louise Stutes <Rep.Louise.Stutes@akleg.gov>; Rep. David Talerico <Rep.David.Talerico@akleg.gov>; Rep. Geran Tarr <Rep.Geran.Tarr@akleg.gov>; Rep. Adam Wool <Rep.Adam.Wool@akleg.gov>
Subject: Please Oppose S.B. 89

Dear House Health and Social Services Committee,

As a lifelong Alaskan I am aware of our state's devastatingly high rates of sexually transmitted infections, domestic and sexual violence. Unfortunately, instead of protecting the health and well-being of Alaskans, S.B. 89 is a bill which increase barriers on access to sexual health education and put additional pressure on school districts during a time when they are already struggling with a major budget crisis.

During the 2013-2014 school year, less than a quarter of Alaskan secondary schools offered the recommended HIV, STI, and pregnancy prevention education. Alaska ranks among the worst states for comprehensive medically accurate sex education and these bills will not reverse our state's troubling statistics regarding STIs, teen pregnancy, domestic and sexual violence. Instead, this bill limits students' access to important information to assist them in making healthy life decisions. This bill also threatens teachers, doctors, and abortion providers with unreasonable penalties and sanctions. Limiting Alaskan students' access to medically accurate, non-judgmental, and comprehensive sex education and penalizing those who provide young people with such information is counter productive towards improving the health and well-being of Alaskans. During this time of an unprecedented budget crisis we should be focusing our energy in other places. As your constituent I ask that you oppose S.B. 89.

Thank you,

Amy Cross

Taneeka Hansen

From: Ronald Johnson <rajohnson@alaska.edu>
Sent: Friday, April 01, 2016 1:13 PM
To: Rep. Paul Seaton
Cc: Rep. Adam Wool; Rep. Geran Tarr; Rep. David Talerico; Rep. Neal Foster; Monte Lynn Jordan
Subject: SB 89

Categories: Taneeka

Dear Rep Seaton,

I urge you not to support SB 89 and hope it does not get out of your committee.

Clearly, this bill, if it became law, would transfer the task and costs of providing sex education from Planned Parenthood to the State.

I've heard testimony to the effect that Alaska has public health nurses that could do this job to fill out their days. If that is true, then maybe we can save money by eliminating some public health nurse positions and hence save general fund money.

Abortion is not discussed in the Planned Parenthood presentations. If the bill sponsors underlying thoughts are focused on preventing abortions, the best action to take is to encourage a vibrant sex education effort.

--

Ron Johnson
Professor Emeritus
Mechanical and Environmental Engineering
Univ of Alaska Fairbanks

2113 Jack St
Fairbanks, AK 99709

Taneeka Hansen

From: Robert A. Penland <penland@alaska.net>
Sent: Sunday, April 03, 2016 8:37 PM
To: Rep. Paul Seaton
Cc: Taneeka Hansen; Jenny Martin; Rep. Mike Chenault
Subject: Testimony in opposition to SB 89

Dear Rep. Seaton,

Please enter our opposition to the subject bill into the record, and consider these concerns in your deliberations.
Disclaimer: We are not employees of any school district nor are we members of Planned Parenthood.

We strongly object to a number of elements in this ill-advised and unnecessary bill.

- This proposed bill is government overreach at its worst, as it would usurp the right of local school districts (and thereby local residents) to make their own decisions as appropriate to the needs of their community.
- The bill is unconstitutional in as much as it singles out a particular organization for discriminatory treatment, with no factual basis for justification. Claims of Planned Parenthood promoting promiscuity and abortion in schools have been thoroughly discredited and are indefensible in any possible ensuing litigation.
- The “opt-in” provision places an undue and unfunded burden on schools. This requirement would be unwieldy and ineffective, resulting in a “default” position whereby children of uninvolved parents would be excluded from any number of activities – not just sex education.
- Allowing withdrawal of students from any and all testing precludes obtaining accurate performance-based metrics on schools and students alike.
- The proposed legislation blurs the separation of church and state. For example, the provision for withdrawal of children for religious holidays opens up a Pandora’s box of frequent absences when the diversity of religious beliefs is factored in. This is another unfunded burden on schools, when one considers the logistics of reviewing and tracking all such requests and absences. It also places a burden on teachers, who will have to expend extra efforts to help these excused students “catch up” due to excessive absences.

- This bill has the potential to gut curriculum and content by permitting withdrawal of children from classes for the most specious of reasons. It will potentially force schools to manage all manner of alleged objections and will undoubtedly further stress already overloaded educational resources.

- Contrary to its intended purpose, this bill will likely result in an increase in STDs, unplanned pregnancies and inappropriate behaviors among our youth. It adds nothing to the reduction of sexual assaults or abusive behaviors.

- Finally, what does “Physical Examinations for teachers” have to do with this bill? We fail to see a connection to its stated purpose.

In summary, this bill is beyond redemption, even with the liberal use of amendments. The bill is so poorly written it should be discarded in its entirety. Please relegate it to the scrap heap and get to work on the budget.

Bob & Diane Penland

Soldotna; H.D. 29

Taneeka Hansen

From: Marilyn Russell <marilynrsll@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 03, 2016 9:17 PM
To: Rep. Paul Seaton; Rep. Liz Vazquez; Rep. Neal Foster; Rep. Louise Stutes; Rep. David Talerico; Rep. Geran Tarr; Rep. Adam Wool
Subject: SB 89

Dear Representative(s),
I am VERY opposed to SB 89. I am opposed to banning Planned Parenthood in public schools. I have seen, first hand, the EXCELLENT lessons that Planned Parenthood shares in classrooms. Such is my niece's job in Oregon.

Please vote "NO" on SB 89.

Marilyn Russell
221 Well St.
Fairbanks, AK 99701

--

Marilyn Russell
RPCV Burkina Faso
2013 - 2015