

Taylor Thrush

From: Scott Green <greenhs45@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 27, 2020 3:22 PM
To: Taylor Thrush
Subject: Oppose HB4739

Although we support keeping children healthy and safe in the school environment, there are numerous concerns with this bill in its current form. Therefore I cannot support this bill as written.

1. **It is overly broad.** 'Health and safety' is not defined anywhere in the language of the bill, therefore MDHHS would have full control of its interpretation through rulemaking without any limitations. As written it is uncertain if this applies to inspection of school structures, equipment such as tables, air quality or if this could also apply to behaviors and activities that MDHHS deems 'unsafe' or 'unhealthy' (such as children with vaccine exemptions). Without clear boundaries this gives unprecedented authority for MDHHS officials to 'police' our schools and have potential access to children or records they would otherwise not be able to access.

2. **Schools already undergo safety inspections.** Schools are already inspected for potential safety hazards through LARA, the Bureau of Construction Codes, Bureau of Community and Health Systems and OSHA.

3. **It's expensive.** The Legislative Analysis of this bill suggest that annual inspections of over 4500 private and public school buildings would require upwards of \$4 million annually and close to 40 full time equivalents employed within the largest bureaucracy in Michigan, MDHHS. Without any clarity on what defines a health and safety violation, it is unclear what costs will be incurred by schools to correct any infractions. Schools are already either losing money or running on an extremely tight margin.

Respectfully,

Scott Green
5311 McDowell
Muskegon, MI 49441

Taylor Thrush

From: Albertina Simone <alsim30@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 27, 2020 1:17 PM
To: Taylor Thrush
Subject: Bill HB4739

Dear Mr. Thrush,

I have read about this bill which will be presented this week. I strongly OPPOSE this bill. I am very much in support of safety in schools and protecting our children. Having said that, this bill is too broad and does not define the criteria. A table collapsing and killing a child is absolutely horrific and should be dealt with. But that's not what this bill does. It is too obscurely defined and allows for who knows what to be included under this umbrella. As a parent and a strong proponent of child safety, that is of great concern to me. For example, could this bill be used to force vaccination and abolish my current right to make that decision? Could this bill force my child to have to go out into hot sun even when she is very sensitive to it and burns very easily in spite of applying sunscreen and other protection? These are just two of countless potential scenarios.

I appreciate the opportunity to voice my concerns and applaud your efforts to ensure safety for our children. But this bill is not the answer.

Regards and thanks,

Albertina Simone

Taylor Thrush

From: Kari Robinson <kariberry@ymail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 27, 2020 1:21 PM
To: Taylor Thrush
Subject: Opposing HB4739

Although we support keeping children healthy and safe in the school environment, there are numerous concerns with this bill in its current form. Therefore we cannot support this bill as written.

1. It is overly broad. 'Health and safety' is not defined anywhere in the language of the bill, therefore MDHHS would have full control of its interpretation through rulemaking without any limitations. As written it is uncertain if this applies to inspection of school structures, equipment such as tables, air quality or if this could also apply to behaviors and activities that MDHHS deems 'unsafe' or 'unhealthy' (such as children with vaccine exemptions). Without clear boundaries this gives unprecedented authority for MDHHS officials to 'police' our schools and have potential access to children or records they would otherwise not be able to access.

2. Schools already undergo safety inspections. Schools are already inspected for potential safety hazards through LARA, the Bureau of Construction Codes, Bureau of Community and Health Systems and OSHA.

3. It's expensive. The Legislative Analysis of this bill suggest that annual inspections of over 4500 private and public school buildings would require upwards of \$4 million annually and close to 40 full time equivalents employed within the largest bureaucracy in Michigan, MDHHS. Without any clarity on what defines a health and safety violation, it is unclear what costs will be incurred by schools to correct any infractions. Schools are already either losing money or running on an extremely tight margin.

Sincerely,
Kari Robinson
2881 Auburn Rd
Auburn Hills, MI 48326

Taylor Thrush

From: Ashley A. Phibbs <aaphibbs@kalittaair.com>
Sent: Monday, January 27, 2020 1:24 PM
To: Taylor Thrush
Subject: HB 4739

Hello,

I am writing in regards to HB 4739 that will be heard January 28th. I am writing to voice my concern with this Bill. While as a parent, I hold children's safety a very high concern, I feel this Bill is extremely vague and costly. School already undergo safety inspections through LARA, the Bureau of Construction Codes, Bureau of Community and Health Systems and OSHA. The Bill fails to outline the definition of "Health and Safety" that it speaks of. Without that language, it leaves the BILL open to a vast amount of interpretation. This Bill should not be considered until a clear definition is at least defined and set forth.

Best Regards,

Ashley A. Phibbs
Astro Project Manager
Kalitta Air, LLC
Tel: 734-544-7031 Ext. 6110
Fax: 734-484-3640
aaphibbs@kalittaair.com

Taylor Thrush

From: Gennah Hill <gennahj@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 27, 2020 1:31 PM
To: Taylor Thrush
Subject: HB 4739 hearing Written Testimony

I'd like to support written testimony for tomorrow's Education Committee hearing regarding HB 4739.

My name is Gennah Hill and I live in Michigan's beautiful rural thumb. My heart weeps for Lilliana's hurting family.

Her mother says in her online testimony "Multiple systems failed Lilliana and my family". Would an additional 'system' even have prevented her tragic death? And at the cost of opening the floodgates of infinite spending and rulemaking outside of our legislation? What I mean by that is 3 things:

1. It is overly broad. 'Health and safety' is not defined anywhere in the language of the bill, therefore MDHHS would have full control of its interpretation through rulemaking without any limitations. As written it is uncertain if this applies to inspection of school structures, equipment such as tables, air quality or if this could also apply to behaviors and activities that MDHHS deems 'unsafe' or 'unhealthy' (such as children with vaccine exemptions). Without clear boundaries this gives unprecedented authority for MDHHS officials to 'police' our schools and have potential access to children or records they would otherwise not be able to access.
2. Schools already undergo safety inspections. Schools are already inspected for potential safety hazards through LARA, the Bureau of Construction Codes, Bureau of Community and Health Systems and OSHA.
3. It's expensive. The Legislative Analysis of this bill suggest that annual inspections of over 4500 private and public school buildings would require upwards of \$4 million annually and close to 40 full time equivalents employed within the largest bureaucracy in Michigan, MDHHS. Without any clarity on what defines a health and safety violation, it is unclear what costs will be incurred by schools to correct any infractions. Schools are already either losing money or running on an extremely tight margin.

I urge the committee to reflect with the highest clarity on this bill. As written, it is not the best way to protect children and is alarming in its breadth. Please support children, not HB 4739.

Thank you,
Gennah Hill

Taylor Thrush

From: keith webb <keith3webb@live.com>
Sent: Monday, January 27, 2020 1:57 PM
To: Taylor Thrush
Subject: HB 4739 opposition

Dear HR,

I oppose HB 4739.

It is overly broad. 'Health and safety' is not defined anywhere in the language of the bill, therefore MDHHS would have full control of its interpretation through rulemaking **without any limitations**. As written it is uncertain if this applies to inspection of school structures, equipment such as tables, air quality or if this could also apply to behaviors and activities that MDHHS deems 'unsafe' or 'unhealthy' (such as children with vaccine exemptions). Without clear boundaries this bill is in danger of infringing upon our constitutional rights.

Keith Webb
11882 Hinman Rd
Eagle, MI 48822

Taylor Thrush

From: Dr. Heather Schueler <drhschueler@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 27, 2020 2:12 PM
To: Taylor Thrush
Subject: HB 4739

To: Taylor Thrush, Ryan Berman, and Representatives Eisen and Garza,

I am writing to ask you to please oppose HB 4739. On the surface it is to protect children from faulty equipment. I support keeping children healthy and safe in the school environment, but there are numerous concerns with this bill in its current form. Therefore I cannot support this bill as written.

1. It is overly broad. 'Health and safety' is not defined anywhere in the language of the bill, therefore MDHHS would have full control of its interpretation through rulemaking without any limitations. As written it is uncertain if this applies to inspection of school structures, equipment such as tables, air quality or if this could also apply to behaviors and activities that MDHHS deems 'unsafe' or 'unhealthy' (such as children with vaccine exemptions). Without clear boundaries this gives unprecedented authority for MDHHS officials to 'police' our schools and have potential access to children or records they would otherwise not be able to access.

2. Schools already undergo safety inspections. Schools are already inspected for potential safety hazards through LARA, the Bureau of Construction Codes, Bureau of Community and Health Systems and OSHA.

3. It's expensive. The Legislative Analysis of this bill suggests that annual inspections of over 4500 private and public school buildings would require upwards of \$4 million annually and close to 40 full time equivalents employed within the largest bureaucracy in Michigan, MDHHS. Without any clarity on what defines a health and safety violation, it is unclear what costs will be incurred by schools to correct any infractions. Schools are already either losing money or running on an extremely tight margin.

I greatly appreciate your consideration of opposing HB 4739.

-Heather Schueler
Berkley, MI

Taylor Thrush

From: aussiechick <aussiechick@att.net>
Sent: Monday, January 27, 2020 7:39 PM
To: Taylor Thrush
Subject: I oppose HB 4739

I oppose HB 4739

1. **It is overly broad.** 'Health and safety' is not defined anywhere in the language of the bill, therefore MDHHS would have full control of its interpretation through rulemaking without any limitations. As written it is uncertain if this applies to inspection of school structures, equipment such as tables, air quality or if this could also apply to behaviors and activities that MDHHS deems 'unsafe' or 'unhealthy' (such as children with vaccine exemptions). Without clear boundaries this gives unprecedented authority for MDHHS officials to 'police' our schools and have potential access to children or records they would otherwise not be able to access.

2. **Schools already undergo safety inspections.** Schools are already inspected for potential safety hazards through LARA, the Bureau of Construction Codes, Bureau of Community and Health Systems and OSHA.

3. **It's expensive.** The Legislative Analysis of this bill suggest that annual inspections of over 4500 private and public school buildings would require upwards of \$4 million annually and close to 40 full time equivalents employed within the largest bureaucracy in Michigan, MDHHS. Without any clarity on what defines a health and safety violation, it is unclear what costs will be incurred by schools to correct any infractions. Schools are already either losing money or running on an extremely tight margin.

Kara Stephens
6998 S. Royston Rd.
Eaton Rapids, MI
48827

Taylor Thrush

From: danchi@aol.com
Sent: Monday, January 27, 2020 7:56 PM
To: Taylor Thrush
Subject: Lillians Law

I am writing you today with concern for HB 4739 which will be heard in Education committee this Tuesday. This bill, as written, is overly broad, gives unprecedented authority to MDHHS, and will cost taxpayers and possibly schools millions of dollars annually. The bill language does not even mention tables or equipment which is the premise for which the bill was introduced (Lillian's Law).

I urge you to vote no.

My specific concerns are below.

1. It is overly broad. 'Health and safety' is not defined anywhere in the language of the bill, therefore MDHHS would have full control of its interpretation through rule making without any limitations. As written it is uncertain if this applies to inspection of school structures, equipment such as tables, air quality or if this could also apply to behaviors and activities that MDHHS deems 'unsafe' or 'unhealthy' (such as children with vaccine exemptions). Without clear boundaries this gives unprecedented authority for MDHHS officials to 'police' our schools and have potential access to facilities, children or records they would otherwise not be able to access in a non-emergent setting.
2. Schools already undergo safety inspections. Schools are already inspected for potential safety hazards through LARA, the Bureau of Construction Codes, Bureau of Community and Health Systems and OSHA.
3. It's expensive. The Legislative Analysis of this bill suggest that annual inspections of over 4500 private and public school buildings would require upwards of \$4 million annually and close to 40 full time equivalents employed within the largest bureaucracy in Michigan, MDHHS. Without any clarity on what defines a health and safety violation, it is unclear what costs will be incurred by schools to correct any infractions. Schools are already either losing money or running on an extremely tight margin.

Although I empathize with Lillian's parents, and it indeed was a tragic loss, this bill, does address specifically what happened to this poor child.

Personally, I think it is repugnant to use the tragic death of a child to push an agenda you are too cowardly to put in forward. We know what this is about. It's a back door into removing parental autonomy because the language is so broad. This bill is being introduced at the same time multiple states are introducing draconian vaccine bills in their state houses. You know Michigan parents will fight for their children so this bill is attempt to manipulate the existing exemption status in this state. Shame on Representatives Ryan Berman, Eisen (R) and Garza (D) for disrespecting and profaning the memory of Lillian by using her death for their own agenda.

I urge you to vote no.

Rhonda D. Schinke

Taylor Thrush

From: Samantha E <samanthamescobar@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, January 27, 2020 9:34 PM
To: Taylor Thrush
Subject: HB 4739

Although we support keeping children healthy and safe in the school environment, there are numerous concerns with this bill in its current form. Therefore we cannot support this bill as written.

1. It is overly broad. 'Health and safety' is not defined anywhere in the language of the bill, therefore MDHHS would have full control of its interpretation through rulemaking without any limitations. As written it is uncertain if this applies to inspection of school structures, equipment such as tables, air quality or if this could also apply to behaviors and activities that MDHHS deems 'unsafe' or 'unhealthy' (such as children with vaccine exemptions). Without clear boundaries this gives unprecedented authority for MDHHS officials to 'police' our schools and have potential access to children or records they would otherwise not be able to access.

2. Schools already undergo safety inspections. Schools are already inspected for potential safety hazards through LARA, the Bureau of Construction Codes, Bureau of Community and Health Systems and OSHA.

3. It's expensive. The Legislative Analysis of this bill suggest that annual inspections of over 4500 private and public school buildings would require upwards of \$4 million annually and close to 40 full time equivalents employed within the largest bureaucracy in Michigan, MDHHS. Without any clarity on what defines a health and safety violation, it is unclear what costs will be incurred by schools to correct any infractions. Schools are already either losing money or running on an extremely tight margin.

Sincerely, concerned tax payer citizen

Taylor Thrush

From: Angela C <angiecip08x@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, January 27, 2020 10:30 PM
To: Taylor Thrush
Subject: HB4739
Attachments: HB4739.docx

To Whom It May Concern,

My name is Angela Cipriani. I am an early childhood educator and mother writing to oppose HB4739.

Although keeping children healthy and safe in school is important, there are numerous concerns with this bill as written.

First, it is far too broad, without clear definition of what 'health and safety' means, what exactly is to be inspected, or what qualifies as a 'health and safety' infraction. Without written boundaries, interpretation is left entirely to MDHHS and there is no telling what could be labeled an infraction or what costs could be incurred by our already struggling schools to correct any decided infractions.

Aside from it's overly broad language and potentially expensive repercussions, it is entirely unnecessary as our schools already undergo safety inspections through LARA, the Bureau of Construction Codes, Bureau of Community and Health Systems and OSHA.

Please vote no on HB4739.

Thank you,
Angela Cipriani

Taylor Thrush

From: Tricia Ronan <tricia.a.ronan@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 27, 2020 10:47 PM
To: Taylor Thrush
Subject: Oppose MB4739

Although we support keeping children healthy and safe in the school environment, there are numerous concerns with this bill in its current form. Therefore we cannot support this bill as written.

1. It is overly broad. 'Health and safety' is not defined anywhere in the language of the bill, therefore MDHHS would have full control of its interpretation through rulemaking without any limitations. As written it is uncertain if this applies to inspection of school structures, equipment such as tables, air quality or if this could also apply to behaviors and activities that MDHHS deems 'unsafe' or 'unhealthy' (such as children with vaccine exemptions). Without clear boundaries this gives unprecedented authority for MDHHS officials to 'police' our schools and have potential access to children or records they would otherwise not be able to access.

2. Schools already undergo safety inspections. Schools are already inspected for potential safety hazards through LARA, the Bureau of Construction Codes, Bureau of Community and Health Systems and OSHA.

3. It's expensive. The Legislative Analysis of this bill suggest that annual inspections of over 4500 private and public school buildings would require upwards of \$4 million annually and close to 40 full time equivalents employed within the largest bureaucracy in Michigan, MDHHS. Without any clarity on what defines a health and safety violation, it is unclear what costs will be incurred by schools to correct any infractions. Schools are already either losing money or running on an extremely tight margin

Tricia A. Ronan, CEO
T.A.B. Massage and Fitness
Board Cert. & State Licensed Massage Therapist
Cert. Essential Oil Educator
Master Fitness Coach
Sent from my iPhone

Taylor Thrush

From: Tiffany Woodard <woodardt1010@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2020 8:22 AM
To: Taylor Thrush
Subject: HB4739

Good Morning, to anyone considering this bill HB 4739 it seems that there has been a bill introduced that will be discussed today. Unfortunately myself and many peers will not be able to attend and voice our opinion. We typically keep a hold on these things, but this one was sneaky and that in itself warrants and issue for me.

Second is, my top priority in everything I do is for my child, and her peers to receive the best education possible. We have learned that our fit in schooling is either homeschooling or independent. The independent and private schools already have quite the extensive list of safety inspections. To be exact they are already through the Bureau of Construction Codes, Bureau of Community and Health Systems, OSHA, along with LARA. I am going to ask that you take the focus and push it into your PUBLIC system which is at utmost importance and NEED right NOW. Perhaps the deaths from bullying incidents etc, and so forth. Perhaps using the funds to LOWER class number sizes, get better education brought into your government funded schools. Which is SO low, children are bullied so bad, children are killing themselves, that they GO to independent and private schools to be SAFE. You need to get better inspection in place of the public areas before this as a threshold.

Third- Funding, again see above. As a private educator I can assure you, the funds are needed in the current FAILING school systems. I will not ever send my child to such a school.

Lastly, your bill is very broad. It does not even direct the reason it was brought up. What do you intend to do with the bill to actually IMPROVE the safety of our independent and private schools?

I can assure you that this is leaving many more questions than answers, and many of us are concerned that there is an actual worry behind this.

Please read this bill thoroughly, please visit a few of our schools and see why our families choose these places. Don't let use this accident as a way to maneuver in and destroy the last place these children have hope in. There are MANY more accidents that need to be directed in the places that send our children to where they are going.

signed-

a concerned Deaf, Disabled, Vaccine injured teacher, mother, wife.

Taylor Thrush

From: Betty Gusho <bgusho@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2020 8:40 AM
To: Taylor Thrush
Subject: HB 4739

I am writing to oppose HB 4739 is a bill introduced by Representative Ryan Berman (R) and cosponsored by Representative Eisen (R) and Garza (D).

Although I strongly support keeping children healthy and safe in the school environment, there are numerous concerns with this bill in its current form. Therefore I cannot support this bill as written.

1. It is overly broad. 'Health and safety' is not defined anywhere in the language of the bill, therefore MDHHS would have full control of its interpretation through rulemaking without any limitations. As written it is uncertain if this applies to inspection of school structures, equipment such as tables, air quality or if this could also apply to behaviors and activities that MDHHS deems 'unsafe' or 'unhealthy' (such as children with vaccine exemptions). Without clear boundaries this gives unprecedented authority for MDHHS officials to 'police' our schools and have potential access to children or records they would otherwise not be able to access.

2. Schools already undergo safety inspections. Schools are already inspected for potential safety hazards through LARA, the Bureau of Construction Codes, Bureau of Community and Health Systems and OSHA.

3. It's expensive. The Legislative Analysis of this bill suggest that annual inspections of over 4500 private and public school buildings would require upwards of \$4 million annually and close to 40 full time equivalents employed within the largest bureaucracy in Michigan, MDHHS. Without any clarity on what defines a health and safety violation, it is unclear what costs will be incurred by schools to correct any infractions. Schools are already either losing money or running on an extremely tight margin.

Thank you, Betty Gusho
1195 Lyonhurst
Birmingham, Mi. 48009
Sent from my iPad

Taylor Thrush

From: Jeannie Kaiser <jeannie.kaiser@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2020 8:52 AM
To: Taylor Thrush
Subject: Health in schools

This needs to be specific and not broad. Individuals have different needs. We are genetically unique and all respond different. So if this is for building codes and air quality and drinking water and structure this needs to be defined. As immune safety that is individual, genetically a different issue. Thank you

Sent from my iPhone

Taylor Thrush

From: kristina huey <kristinamarie820@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2020 8:56 AM
To: Taylor Thrush
Subject: WE OPPOSE HB 4739!!!

IMPORTANT!! WE OPPOSE HB 4739

Although we support keeping children healthy and safe in the school environment, there are numerous concerns with this bill in its current form. Therefore we cannot support this bill as written.

1. **It is overly broad.** 'Health and safety' is not defined anywhere in the language of the bill, therefore MDHHS would have full control of its interpretation through rulemaking without any limitations. As written it is uncertain if this applies to inspection of school structures, equipment such as tables, air quality or if this could also apply to behaviors and activities that MDHHS deems 'unsafe' or 'unhealthy' (such as children with vaccine exemptions). Without clear boundaries this gives unprecedented authority for MDHHS officials to 'police' our schools and have potential access to children or records they would otherwise not be able to access.

2. **Schools already undergo safety inspections.** Schools are already inspected for potential safety hazards through LARA, the Bureau of Construction Codes, Bureau of Community and Health Systems and OSHA.

3. **It's expensive.** The Legislative Analysis of this bill suggest that annual inspections of over 4500 private and public school buildings would require upwards of \$4 million annually and close to 40 full time equivalents employed within the largest bureaucracy in Michigan, MDHHS. Without any clarity on what defines a health and safety violation, it is unclear what costs will be incurred by schools to correct any infractions. Schools are already either losing money or running on an extremely tight margin.

Taylor Thrush

From: Katherine Henry <khenry4mi@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2020 9:14 AM
To: Taylor Thrush
Subject: HB 4739

Good morning. I understand there is a hearing today on HB 4739, which was introduced by Representative Ryan Berman (R) and cosponsored by Representative Eisen (R) and Garza (D). The bill was introduced after a tragic story of a child who was killed after a foldable table fell on her at preschool. The bill would direct MDHHS to annually inspect all 4500 private and public school buildings for 'health and safety' violations. However, there is no mention of tables or equipment in the bill, and it is extremely broad and could encompass whatever MDHHS determines is a 'health and safety' infraction.

I am unable to attend the meeting today, but the committee's thoughtful deliberation on this bill is very important to me. I send this letter as a mother of 4 (who at one time or another have all been in a private daycare). I also send this letter as an attorney concerned with government overreach, especially that of unelected bureaucrats who would be given far too broad a power under this bill.

Although I support keeping children healthy and safe in the school environment, there are numerous concerns with this bill in its current form. Therefore, I urge the committee to not allow this bill to move forward as written.

1. It is overly broad. 'Health and safety' is not defined anywhere in the language of the bill, therefore MDHHS would have full control of its interpretation through rulemaking without any limitations. As written, it is uncertain if this applies to inspection of school structures, equipment such as tables, air quality or if this could also apply to behaviors and activities that MDHHS deems 'unsafe' or 'unhealthy' (such as children with vaccine exemptions). Without clear boundaries this gives unprecedented authority for MDHHS officials to 'police' our schools and have potential access to children or records they would otherwise not be able to access.

2. Schools already undergo safety inspections. Schools are already inspected for potential safety hazards through LARA, the Bureau of Construction Codes, Bureau of Community and Health Systems and OSHA. We don't need yet another governmental agency doing this same task, especially given the undue burden it would place on small daycares and preschools.

3. It's expensive. The Legislative Analysis of this bill suggest that annual inspections of over 4500 private and public school buildings would require upwards of \$4 million annually and close to 40 full time equivalents employed within the largest bureaucracy in Michigan, MDHHS. Without any clarity on what defines a health and safety violation, it is unclear what costs will be incurred by schools to correct any infractions. Schools are already either losing money or running on an extremely tight margin.

Every tragedy does not necessitate new laws being passed. If the sponsors of this bill have already read the current laws & regulations that provide for inspection by the other governmental agencies, *and* truly believe those inspection requirements to be insufficient to ensure the safety of children, then specific changes or additions to those inspection requirements would be the appropriate way to handle it. Not implementing an entirely new inspection layer to the mix.

Taylor Thrush

From: homemailz <homemailz@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2020 9:27 AM
To: Taylor Thrush
Subject: Oppose HB 4739 in Committee this Tuesday 1/28/2020

Honorable Pam Hornberger and
House Education Committee,

I am writing to you today to let you know that I am against passing HB 4739 in its current form. The bill's current focus is overly broad and does nothing to specifically address equipment failure which was the cause of Lilliana's death.

Current Michigan laws already require school inspections by OSHA, LARA, the Bureau of Construction Codes and the Bureau of Community and Health Systems. Lilliana's death was caused by an oversight by the school district/state inspection process and does not require the State of Michigan to layer another set of costly laws on top of the current inspection laws to combat the problem of equipment failure. Instead accountability for the people/person responsible, under the current laws, for failing to inspect the tables which caused Lilliana's death needs to be addressed and if necessary legal action pursued.

Ohio passed a similar law in response to the 2003 death of 6 year old, Jarod Bennett. Jarod's law was passed in 2005 but repealed in 2009 because the regulations proved too costly for schools to enact as written.

We also cannot give MDHHS free reign with HB 4739 to police our schools. The bill is written in such vague terms and does not even directly address equipment failure which is what cause Lilliana's death. The bill is written in such broad terms that it would give MDHHS unprecedented authority to "police" our schools to determine what is safe and healthy for Michigan children. HB 4739 is a bill without boundaries which is very dangerous because it would allow MDHHS to pursue investigations into whatever they deem to be "unhealthy and unsafe" for our children under the guise of protecting them. This could lead to an overt focus by MDHHS on limiting behavior and activities that are currently protected under Michigan law, such as vaccine exemptions and religious activities.

We certainly need to protect innocent children from school equipment accidents such as the one that killed precious Lilliana, but let's set aside emotion and first focus on the root cause of her death which was equipment inspection failure under the current state laws. This does not require a new set of laws but instead we need to hold those accountable who were responsible for the lapse in determining that the straps holding the table in place which killed Lilliana were a safety issue.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Sandra Peterson
Precinct #3 Delegate
Green Oak Township
11223 Sand Crane Way
South Lyon, MI 48178

Taylor Thrush

From: Amanda Taylor <mandy1287@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2020 7:23 AM
To: Taylor Thrush
Subject: HB 4739

To whom this may concern,

I am a concerned citizen regarding the new bill you are trying to pass HB 4739.

First of all, it is way too broad when it comes to "health and regulations." It needs to be more specific of what that includes. No where does it define what these health inspections are limited to. They're needs to be limitations. Second of all, schools already go through safety inspection through LARA. And lastly, it's very expensive and unnecessary.

Please take this into consideration. Thanks Amanda Taylor