

## Senate State Affairs Committee

**Wednesday, March 20, 2024 - 8:00 A.M.**

### TESTIMONY ON: All Subjects

#### Written Testimony

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
Jenny Emery Davidson	H 710	IP	self	Hailey	Against	Y	26

I ask you to OPPOSE HB 710. I look forward to presenting reasons against this bill, including:

- It pre-empts local control. Even out-of-state parties with no connection to an Idaho library could ask for a book to be removed to an adult only access area.
- The vague language of "other material harmful to minors" opens the door for all kinds of materials to be challenged, even if those items are shelved in the adult collection already.
- This bill provides a mechanism for censorship, stigmatizing people who want to check out a book that one person deems offensive. People would have to show identity documents to check out those books.

Maureen Anderson	H 710	T	Self	Lewiston	For	Y	7
------------------	-------	---	------	----------	-----	---	---

As a mother and grandmother, I do everything I can to protect my children and grandchildren from being exposed to what I, and most reasonable adults, would consider inappropriate influences. When my children were younger, I never thought about them being exposed to highly sexualized material without my knowledge and/or consent. Today, I can no longer say the same about what is happening in our public schools and libraries. Last year, I was abruptly shocked out of my sense of security by my very own daughter. She came home from school and wanted to talk to me about a book she and her friends had found in the Lewiston High School library...a book that made them all "uncomfortable". Prior to this, I had heard the rumblings about inappropriate books and materials as well as legislation being presented around the country to remove such books and materials from public schools and libraries, but felt that in such a small town, we were somehow isolated. Was I ever wrong!

I decided to take the time to start delving into the book she took a picture of and was SHOCKED to say the least! The book is called Push, by an author "named" Sapphire and is the graphic story of a young woman who is repeatedly raped and impregnated by her own father, told from her perspective in what can best be described as ebonics. At one point in the story, she speaks of how her father is in the process of raping her and turns to the baby he has already fathered with her and "take off her Pampers and try to stick his thing in

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Maureen Anderson	<i>cont.</i>						7
------------------	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	---

Precious". I had to force myself to read further and kept having to push down my feelings of nausea while wiping the tears from my eyes. How on earth could a book like this be in my DAUGHTER's School?

I have never considered myself an activist, but I'm telling you, I became one that day! I started researching more and more of these books and found them...in the Teen section of our public library, the High School library, and even my Granddaughter's Middle School library. I took it to the school board and testified before them...and I am grateful they heard me out and appeared to want to do something. But here we are, almost a year later, and NOTHING has changed! The books are still on the shelves with our Tax Dollars continuing to provide them. This is abhorrent and it needs to stop. If I were to hand ANY of these books to a child other than my own, I would be rightfully charged with criminal charges! But somehow, because it is a librarian or a school staff member, it is somehow OK? Please...make it make sense! Idaho claims to be a Pro-Family, Pro-Children State...PROVE IT! Stand up for the innocence our children deserve to preserve! Vote YES on H-710.

Joseph Crupper	H 710	W	self	Pocatello	Against	N	29
----------------	-------	---	------	-----------	---------	---	----

I am writing to ask you to vote No on HB 710. This library bill is just the old bill with a different number. It is as unpopular with the people in our district as the last one.

I am against bounty legislation, especially when it comes to libraries. This bill is simply a tactic meant to tire out libraries until they feel they have to close rather than be scared some bad actor is going to ruin them forever.

People who don't want to read queer stories just shouldn't read them. If they don't want their kids to read them, they shouldn't let them come to the library. Don't ruin it for the rest of us.

Jessica Boggs	H 710	W	Self	Boise	Against	N	15
---------------	-------	---	------	-------	---------	---	----

My family opposes this bad bill and the impact it will have on our local libraries and our community at large. We believe in value our right to determine what to read, and this bill is a huge government overstep into that freedom. We elect our library trustees and we support the existing policies in place that create meaningful, diverse, and kind collections of literature. Please say no to 710.

Thank you!

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
Vicente Diaz	H 710	W	Self	Nampa	Against	N	13

Stop trying to categorize literacy as dangerous. The facism in bills like this is what is really dangerous. These attacks on people of color and lgbt people with the lie that it's protecting kids is ridiculous. Bills like this that create made up problems in order to demonize and ban the existence of marginalized people need to stop. You should be embarrassed for not working on legislation that helps people. The minimum wage is still 7.25 which just makes the housing and homelessness issues worse. How is banning books the top of your priorities?

Erin Kennedy	H 710	IP	Self and Idaho Library Association	Boise	Against	Y	18
--------------	-------	----	------------------------------------	-------	---------	---	----

Dear Senators,

My name is Erin Kennedy, District 17. I am speaking on behalf of myself and the Idaho Library Association in opposition to House Bill 710.

This bill is an attack on parental rights to choose what is best for their families, an attack on local control, and an attack on the public institutions that are at the heart of their communities. Fundamentally, this bill is unworkable from a practical standpoint:

1) Libraries will not be subject to "just" a \$250 fine. They will also be subject to unspecified damages and/or injunctive action, which could be devastating.

2) Libraries do not have "adults only" or restricted sections. They do not have the staff to police such a section. Placing a book "behind the desk," where not even adults can freely access it, is unconstitutional.

3) It does not matter if a library deems a book to not be obscene for minors according to the Miller Test. If a patron disagrees, they can sue no matter the content in the book, and no matter what outline of the Miller Test is provided on the reconsideration form. Note that of the approximately 136 books that Idaho Library Association tracked as officially challenged in Idaho in 2023, more than 20% had NO sexual content. Patrons who challenged these books before will challenge them again; the only difference should H710 pass is that they can now sue a library for failing to abide by one person's opinion of where a book should be shelved.

4) Libraries will be open to a lawsuit if they "promote, give, or make available" any material that a patron believes is "harmful to minors." This vague language means that a child could simply see a book in an adult section and a parent or guardian could claim harm and ask the book to be moved to

a restricted section. This vague language could lead to unconstitutional restrictions on access to information for adults as well as minors.

5) The bill includes no mechanism to prevent bad actors from attempting to gain a payday or cripple an institution by bringing a civil

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Erin Kennedy	<i>cont.</i>						18
--------------	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	----

action against a library. Anyone can make the challenge - including an anti-LGBTQ activist from New Jersey. Even if the civil action fails, libraries will still pay legal fees and spend time in litigation (staff and resources). This IS taxpayer money.

Idaho's libraries already have processes in place for patrons to request the reconsideration of materials, and these processes work. Libraries already move items to different sections or remove them entirely when doing so aligns with their policies and the First Amendment. For legislators who say that they have seen the books and they haven't been moved, I ask, which books? Did you or the person who brought them to your attention read it in whole? Did you follow the library's process to request reconsideration? If not, you can't expect the library to move a book simply because you found it offensive. That would violate other patron's right to receive information. If you did follow the library's process, did the library provide a reasoned explanation for why the book was not moved or removed? Was it because, on the whole, the book contained serious literary, artistic, political, or scientific value for minors?

The only problem here is that a minority of patrons with loud voices do not like the decisions made by libraries about materials that they find personally offensive, but which are not legally obscene for minors.

~Erin Kennedy  
District 17

Laura DeLaney	H 710	IP	self	Boise	Against	Y	19
---------------	-------	----	------	-------	---------	---	----

I am Laura DeLaney, the co-owner of Rediscovered Books in Boise, ID, a former teacher with over 17 years of experience in both public and private schools, and the parent of two children who used public libraries in Idaho for their entire childhoods.

House Bill No. 710 removes the process of community review boards for determining the status of a particular book in a school or public library. It allows a single voice to have the right to change the decision of a professional librarian. To make matters worse, the person who brought the complaint will collect at least \$250 from the library if the library does not comply with the demand. To comply, librarians must move the book to an adult section with ID requirements, or remove the book completely from the library. There is no option to appeal or have the community review the complaint.

This bill is against the ideals of democracy where there is consideration, discussion and a process to make decisions that affect the community. These processes are already in place at both school and public libraries across the state.

I grew up in rural Illinois on a dairy farm five miles outside of town. My school district was over 50 miles in diameter, and the library was essential to my childhood. When I had questions, the library was there and I could gain information that I needed. Often these

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Laura DeLaney	<i>cont.</i>						19
---------------	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	----

were questions that my family could not or would not answer. The librarian in town would guide me to what I needed, and I trusted her judgment. She shared with me time and again the right amount of information for my age and situation. She was a professional just as the librarians in Idaho today. I trust their judgment to create libraries that serve the needs of all their patrons.

Libraries today fulfill the same role for the people in their community. They are ethical and upstanding people who adhere to the ideal that access to books, information, and resources is a right to be embraced and supported.

Librarians go through extensive education regarding collection building around the needs and desires of a community. The job of a librarian is to provide books and resources addressing broad areas of education, entertainment, and resources. This is a complex position that should not be undermined by the narrow view of a single individual. No matter the size of the community, there is great variety in the needs of the people who live in it. Libraries connect people to stories and ideas that bring the entire world within their walls regardless of the size of the town the library is in.

This committee should vote no on House Bill 710. That is the work that needs to be done. House Bill 710 sets up a system where librarians are forced to conform to a complaint with no room for community review or professional understanding of the diverse needs and interests of the community at large.

Thank you for listening to my statement and I hope you consider my thoughts in your decision.

Erin Argyle	H 710	W	Self	Boise	Against	N	18
-------------	-------	---	------	-------	---------	---	----

I am against this bill. Libraries should never be censored in any way shape or form. It is critical that they remain open and their information available to everyone. It is a parents responsibility to make the choices for their child, not the government.

Nicole Pantera	H 710	IP	Self	Boise	Against	Y	19
----------------	-------	----	------	-------	---------	---	----

Although I am a member of the Board of Trustees of the Boise Public Library, I am testifying personally. This Bill is problematic in that it will encourage private lawsuits to be brought against books prior to the local board process taking place. The Board must represent its local constituents. There is a process in place whereby these local constituents request books to come into the collection, pursuant to Board approved policies that do not permit obscene materials. In addition, there is an established process for materials to be relocated or removed, with three levels of review. This would cut off this review process, and encourage private lawsuits instead. Because of the unclear standard, we do not believe these would be deemed frivolous and thus would result in a financial burden when folks challenge non-obscene books that have not even had a review process, and are ultimately not obscene or removable. The costs would still be incurred. In addition, there are substantial costs to implement the designated adult provisions that would be very burdensome for rural libraries. Finally, this all has had a demoralizing and chilling impact on librarians, who are kind, honest, public

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Nicole Pantera	<i>cont.</i>						19
----------------	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	----

servants. There is no pornography in libraries. please help preserve an important public space with curated, safe materials available to encourage kids to read. This is such a better alternative to internet use and things that kids may otherwise do. Please oppose this bill.

CJ Rasmussno	H 710	W	Myself	Twin Falls	Against	N	25
--------------	-------	---	--------	------------	---------	---	----

My name is CJ Rasmusson, a resident of Twin Falls, ID. I'm writing, to express my strong opposition to this bill and other bills seeking to censor and restrict access to titles in our public libraries. Librarians are trained professionals, and this does nothing but provide a path for government censorship. This bill offers a bounty with no review or recourse available to libraries that face challenges under this legislation. It strips local control from appointed and elected library boards and trained, professional, librarians, and gives an inordinate amount of control to any single person who decides to challenge a book. History also shows us that these types of laws are most often used to target and oppress minority communities. Libraries have a responsibility to provide services and materials across interests for their entire communities, and parents have the responsibility to instill their family values in their children - it shouldn't fall to the library to act as nannies or parents and it shouldn't be another person's right to decide what is helpful or needed by another family. Likewise, it is not the government's nor the libraries' responsibility to determine what is right for a family. This nationwide moral panic regarding "obscene" materials in libraries is fully manufactured, simply inventing a problem where there is none to use as a cynical political cudgel.

These bills dangerously attempt to curtail the 1st Amendment rights of Idahoans. They are also trying to solve a problem that does not exist. The materials in libraries are not pornography, and the materials used as examples, held up by those wishing to create a moral panic for the sake of political aggrandizing, are either educational or reflect the actual lived experience of the authors. Furthermore, none of these materials pass the complete Miller Test - a standard this legislation does not reflect.

Lastly, due to antiquated language embedded in Idaho code, these bills unfairly discriminate against LGBTQ+ people, and these bills will inevitably be used to attack materials written by/for the LGBTQ+ community regardless of the actual content of these materials with, again, no recourse to prevent this type of abuse.

Please, end this baseless, useless moral panic. Stand for the 1st Amendment. Stand for local control. Stand for individual freedom. Oppose HB 710 and other bills like it.

Amber Havron	H 710	W	Self	Meridian	Against	N	20
--------------	-------	---	------	----------	---------	---	----

I am against this bill because it jeopardizes the safety of our library. The bill is too vague and leads me to believe anyone can get offended by a book and sue the library instead of simply not checking out the book. If there is a book parents do not find appropriate for

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Amber Havron	<i>cont.</i>						20
--------------	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	----

their child that is between that family. Children are not allowed to be in the library unsupervised regardless so the parents have a responsibility to monitor their kids. As far as teens they have the internet on their phones and you think the library land books are the issue? This is censorship and government over reach which is ironic when Idaho proclaimed they are all for limited government control regarding covid. It was everyone's personal conviction then but NOW it's not. It's hypocrisy. Let parents parent their children and the ones who are too lazy to do so that's in them not me. The people who are trying to pass this bill do not have to utilize the library or allow their kids to either.

In ending I feel like our government officials are ignoring the pleas our their constituents. I am tired of telling you all this every single week. Do your job and stop wasting tax dollars with this.

Ps it was never the good buys banning books in history.

Blessings and may you open your ears and eyes to the danger this bill can create.

Evan Holbert	H 710	W	Self	Moscow	Against	N	6
--------------	-------	---	------	--------	---------	---	---

I am against this bill because it's anti-freedom. Plain and simple. Libraries already have systems in place. It's insane to me how a state and political party that boasts small government and freedom wants to do exactly the opposite. I'm a parent. Let me parent my child. I don't expect you, the library, or anybody else to do it for me. Thank you for your time.

Madeleine Bonneville	H 710	W	Self	Boise	Against	N	18
----------------------	-------	---	------	-------	---------	---	----

I am strongly against this bill as it is both a waste of time and money and also restricts the freedom that is so integral to this great country. Libraries already have measures in place to evaluate which books are appropriate to have on shelves. No one is making anyone read any book they don't want to read. A vote for this bill is a sign of falling prey to fear-based policy that shows we are currently being represented by people who aren't putting our rights to freedom first. I will not vote for the re-election of anyone who voted for this bill.

Mary Ann Funk	H 710	W	Self	Lewiston	Against	N	7
---------------	-------	---	------	----------	---------	---	---

I'm writing to express my strong opposition to House Bill 710. This legislation poses significant threats to our libraries and undermines their vital role in providing access to information. You have the opportunity to stop yet another attack on Idaho libraries.

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Mary Ann Funk	<i>cont.</i>						7
---------------	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	---

Firstly, the bill's punitive measures extend beyond a mere fine, exposing libraries to unspecified damages and injunctive actions. Additionally, the requirement for "adults only" sections in libraries is impractical and unconstitutional, especially in school libraries where 18-year-olds share spaces with minors.

Moreover, the vague language regarding what constitutes "harmful to minors" opens libraries to frivolous lawsuits, wasting taxpayer money on legal battles. Furthermore, the bill fails to address the potential misuse of the Miller Test, creating ambiguity in determining obscene material.

Legislation like this has not passed before because the majority of Idahoans of all political stripes want local control and trust the guardrails in place to deal with this claim of obscenity. The majority of Idahoans know that reading a book with gay characters won't make you gay anymore than reading the Bible will make you automatically a Christian.

I urge you to reject HB 710 and uphold the autonomy and integrity of our libraries.

Sincerely,  
Mary Ann Funk

Heather Stout	H 710	V	Self	Moscow	Against	Y	6
---------------	-------	---	------	--------	---------	---	---

Thank you Chairman Guthrie and Committee Members. My name is Heather Stout and I vote in Genesee Idaho. I am a retired professional librarian with over 30+ years of experience in Idaho libraries. I am here today representing myself in opposition to HB 710.

First off, this proposed bill is very vague and it is pure government overreach. This bill does not contain the Full Miller Test as the sponsors keep telling us. I am very afraid that if passed, this version, incomplete as it is, will set libraries up for lawsuits.

Legislators favoring this bill keep telling us that they are just asking libraries to "relocate" books, but the language in the bill goes much further. The bill states that the materials "must not be accessible to minors." In reality, that means locked cabinets, closed stacks and yes, it means removal especially in small, one room libraries. What about "Adults Only" sections? Does that require a wall, a security guard, additional staff to check ID's?? What if a minor pulls a book off the shelf in that section? Also, what about Library Consortiums? What about inter-library loans? I live in an area where I can access library materials throughout a large geographical area. These restrictions are unreasonable and unworkable.

I keep hearing this bill is about "parental control." Yet this bill allows ANYONE to challenge any material whether they live in the community or not, whether they are residents of the school district, or not. In addition, ANYONE can bring legal action at any time



Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Heather Stout	<i>cont.</i>						6
---------------	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	---

regardless of whether the library followed policy, if they disagree with the answer they received. This bill is not about parental control, it is about denying access to constitutionally protected materials because something made you feel uncomfortable.

I have testified and listened to testimony on every library bill that has been introduced in this legislature going back years. In every instance, the overwhelming testimony by our fellow Idahoans is that they are very satisfied with their libraries, very satisfied with the professionals staffing those libraires, and very satisfied with current library policies. HB 710 is unnecessary and wrong for Idaho. I urge you to vote against it.

Lance McGrath	H 710	IP	Idaho Library Association	Nampa	Against	Y	12
---------------	-------	----	---------------------------	-------	---------	---	----

Chair Guthrie and members of the Senate State Affairs Committee,

My name is Lance McGrath and I reside in Nampa, Idaho, District 12. I am the president of the Idaho Library Association and acting in my official capacity.

I register my opposition to House Bill 710 as a father, a freedom-loving American, a native Idahoan, and a librarian. House Bill 710 is a bill in search of a problem.

Idaho’s librarians care about kids. Library workers are parents, grandparents, aunts, and uncles, sisters and brothers. I am the father of three children who I love very much. Idaho libraries, whether school or public, do not provide materials that are harmful to minors. Librarians have earned the public’s trust. Recent public polling shows that a majority of Idahoans polled - 69% - trust librarians to select library materials. 69%.

Librarians believe parents have rights and responsibilities to guide their children’s use of school and public libraries and not dictate their preferences to other families. The private right of action creates a bounty system that will place an incredible financial burden on libraries and open them up to spurious actions and the potential for expensive litigation. The bill also vests too much power over public institutions into the hands of a complainant. There is no check on the process that provides a backdoor book ban option.

A short list of flaws in the bill:

The bill is vague and overreaching.

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Lance McGrath	<b>cont.</b>						12
---------------	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	----

The bill will force libraries to create an "Adults Only" section.

The bill considers ANY depiction of homosexuality as obscene. The language is vague. It is also viewpoint censorship. What constitutes an "act"? Holding hands? Simply having a book with an LGBTQ theme or character(s)? This language will lead to lawsuits against libraries.

The bill is still a bounty bill. Complainants can get \$250 per offense plus undetermined damages. There is no guarantee libraries will recover costs from litigation when they prevail in court. This puts taxpayer money at risk.

Book challenges can come from ANYONE. They do not have to be local community members, library card holders, or residents of a school district.

The bill DOES NOT contain the FULL Miller Test. Libraries face the very real risk of facing lawsuits because of this incomplete inclusion of established constitutional case law.

There is no review process of complaints. Libraries will have to remove identified materials or get sued. This has concerning due process considerations.

The bill is an unfunded mandate. Libraries will have to renovate facilities, move collections, and hire additional staff to check IDs and monitor movement in the library.

The bill will put libraries in a lose-lose situation: Either they comply with the law and run the very real risk of violating citizen access to constitutionally protected materials, or they do not comply and face costly consequences from censors.

This bill poses a significant threat to First Amendment rights and the principles of intellectual freedom that are central to libraries' missions to serve everyone in their communities, not just a select few. The government has a duty to protect its citizens, especially minors, but it cannot do so by infringing on the fundamental rights of free speech and access to constitutionally protected information. Rights that are also extended to minors under the First Amendment.

This bill imposes government restrictions on free speech, relies on vague and overly broad language, is redundant, and will have a chilling effect on free expression. For these reasons, the Idaho Library Association is opposed to House Bill 384 and we ask you to vote NO on House Bill 710.

Respectfully,  
Lance McGrath  
President  
Idaho Library Association

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Lance McGrath	<i>cont.</i>						12
---------------	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	----

Sarah Del Grande	H 710	W	Self	Meridian	Against	N	20
------------------	-------	---	------	----------	---------	---	----

We don't need more government overreach. If parents are concerned about what their children are reading, they can accompany them to the library. The professional librarians and library committees have already done a great job of making sure that what is commonly considered pornography, is not in the libraries.

I hope you'll do the right thing and vote NO on HB710.

Adam Marvel	H 710	W	Self	Stanley	Against	N	8
-------------	-------	---	------	---------	---------	---	---

I am against this bill as it is an attempt to eliminate rural libraries, a lifeblood of connection and entertainment for those of us who live in rural communities, under the guise of saving minors from some vague threat of nudity. By allowing anyone, not just those who live in the library served area, to try to extract money from our community by suing puts financial stress on areas that are already outside the general economic focus of the state. My experience of finding books to read during the long, cold, winters, is that our local library is a lifeline - and to put pressure on our local librarians and facilities from outside the area feels like you are trying to take away local rights to connect and enjoy books and life. If a parent is uncomfortable, then that is their personal responsibility to manage their family and what they read, not their right to take away stories from the rest of us. I urge you to reject this intrusion on personal choice and local control - local libraries are for freedom, not for censorship.

Teresa Lipus	H 710	W	Self	Boise	Against	N	18
--------------	-------	---	------	-------	---------	---	----

I am against this bill as it takes away local control, and is a bounty bill that would allow the claiming of unlimited damages- which are not even clearly defined in the bill.

Kathy Dawes	H 710	W	Self	Moscow	Against	N	6
-------------	-------	---	------	--------	---------	---	---

I am totally against this bill because it is unnecessary and a perfect example of government overreach. Libraries already have library board members who develop formal processes for the public to express their concerns about books, and every community is different.

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Kathy Dawes	<i>cont.</i>						6
-------------	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	---

According to the ninth annual Idaho Public Policy Survey by BSU, nearly 70% of Idahoans trust their libraries and librarians. It is a very vocal minority of Idahoans who want books removed or relocated in their libraries.

It is not the role of the government to enforce laws like this bill is proposing by taking away local control of our libraries. Please vote NO on bill H710.

Dana Dawes	H 710	W	Self	Moscow	Against	N	6
------------	-------	---	------	--------	---------	---	---

I am so very opposed to bill H 710 and all the previous library bills put forth by the Idaho legislature in the last two sessions.

Supporters of this bill have unfounded concerns about sex traffickers and "groomers." In an article in the Idaho Statesman (3-14-24) sociologists stated they recognized where they'd heard these false claims about libraries before — in a conspiracy theory about child sex trafficking, linked to formerly fringe groups that have become mainstream in recent years. There is a very vocal minority in Idaho pushing these bills.

According to the language in this bill, a book entitled "Everybody Poops" would be considered "harmful to minors" because it deals with "excretory functions" (see page 2, line 6 in the bill). That book was a lifesaver for us as young parents whose first-born child screamed constantly during potty training because he thought he was losing part of his body. The book calmed him and made potty training easier on us all.

Please vote NO on bill H 710.

Rebekka Hanson	H 710	W	Self - as an active and lifelong library patron	Rexburg	Against	N	34
----------------	-------	---	---	---------	---------	---	----

I'm writing to express my very strong opposition to HB 710, the proposed bill regarding materials in public and school libraries. This is an unneeded bill - a solution in search of a problem that doesn't actually exist. Libraries already have well-established processes for the reevaluation of any book that is challenged. The state government does not need to step in to codify this.

This is extremely problematic in that it provides monetized incentives to ban books. Any moneys these challengers "win" will come out of already meager library resources, which will further inhibit the library with their mission of providing resources, including computer and wi-fi access, to our communities. I've heard that it may also prohibit libraries in our state from having adequate insurance coverage,

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Rebekka Hanson	<b>cont.</b>						34
----------------	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	----

as insurers will see this risk of lawsuits as too great.

As you well know, Idaho has some of the strictest porn laws in the country. There is no porn in our libraries! Also, materials are in the proper areas for the age groups they are intended for, and every single item already is in full compliance with current Idaho laws regarding child safety and pornography.

House Bill 710 threatens libraries simply because a handful of extremists disagree with the content of books. There's a simple solution for this - just don't check those books out. Leave them for other parents and library goers who do want those materials. Please stop this overreach, and vote NO on this bill.

Bonnie Shuster	H 710	W	Self	Boise	Against	N	19
----------------	-------	---	------	-------	---------	---	----

Chairman Guthrie and committee members: my name is Bonnie Shuster, I live in Boise, I represent myself, and I oppose HB 710. I am out of town, or I would be at the hearing in person.

I count 559 bills introduced during this session to date. Some of these are essential, like appropriation bills, but many are bills that the people of Idaho do not support. Many of us feel that restraint is a sound conservative value and wish you would exercise more of it, especially when it comes to culture war issues.

Our public and school libraries are among our most trusted and valued public institutions; and our public and school librarians are among our most trusted and revered public servants. Yet our public and school libraries and librarians have been under relentless attack by this body for several years. And why? Because some people find some of the materials in their collections to be objectionable.

Have you looked at Idaho Library Association's list of books that have been challenged over the last year? These are not books that would be considered obscene under the Miller test. Yet these are the books that our libraries will be taken to court over under HB 710 if they decline to restrict access to them. Even if every one of these challenges fails in court, the costs to our libraries of defending against these civil suits will be significant. This bill most certainly DOES have a fiscal impact.

Are you aware that many, if not most, of our libraries already have robust policies in place for patrons to raise concerns about materials in the library's collection? I have read many of these policies and I hope that you have, too. The policies varied based on the size of the community, as is appropriate. I do not understand why you refuse to let these community-based policies play out. Every local issue does not require a state law, top down, one-size-fits-all "solution." Sometimes the best action is to decline to act.

Please, just say no. Kill this bill and stop attacking our libraries and librarians. Thank you for your consideration.

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Mary Kirkpatrick	H 710	W	Self	Rexburg	Against	N	34
------------------	-------	---	------	---------	---------	---	----

You will find no evidence to support this bill's implicit claim that libraries are maliciously offering pornography and other inappropriate materials to minors. It is also homophobic in nature to explicitly list any LGBTQ+ materials to be excluded from the library's collection, erasing an entire population of this state's taxpayers who have the same, equal rights and deserve to access books and materials that represent them, the same as any other American. Most libraries already have a collection development policy in place, in which patrons can contest specific titles, making this state-level requirement redundant. What is truly being argued here is censorship of free speech in books and other materials as well as the library patrons' agency and accessibility to a broad educational resource in one of this country's most important public institutions. I acknowledge that individuals will disagree with the content of some library materials, but they have the prerogative to avoid them and the personal responsibility as parents to monitor what their own children are reading. They do not have the right to decide for every child who attends their library. It should not be the library's responsibility to monitor the books their patrons check out for the purpose of censorship. Nor should it be up to their discretion, bias, or judgement what their patrons read, because whatever that is will be the individual's choice. I am firmly against this bill.

Gretchen Wissner	H 710	W	self	Moscow	Against	N	6
------------------	-------	---	------	--------	---------	---	---

Chair Guthrie and members of the Senate State Affairs Committee,

I urge you to vote NO on 710. The bill is not necessary, as most libraries already have policies in place to address complaints. A small vocal minority should not be allowed to influence policy that will impact the materials provided by libraries and available to individuals across the state. The local level is where these decisions should be made. I am also concerned about the fiscal impact on our libraries related to staff time spent relocating materials, reviewing and reworking established policies and procedures, and addressing potential legal actions.

Thank you for your consideration.

Nikson Mathews	H 710	V	Self	Boise	Against	Y	16
----------------	-------	---	------	-------	---------	---	----

Good morning, committee members. My name is Nikson Mathews. I'm a born and raised Idahoan and a resident and active community member of District 16.

I am here to express my strong opposition to House Bill 710. This bill is a threat to our freedom and the vitally important role that libraries play in our communities.

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
Nikson Mathews	<i>cont.</i>						16

This bill allows for a subjective interpretation of what is considered 'obscene,' leading to unnecessary censorship. It undermines the essential role of libraries as inclusive spaces for learning and exploration. It's crucial to note that such measures disproportionately affect books and resources that speak to LGBTQIA+ experiences.

Growing up in a small Idaho town in the 80s and 90s, I experienced firsthand the impact of not having access to books I could see myself in. Today, I am a proud member of the LGBTQIA+ community. But then, I struggled silently, unable to express my identity due to the lack of resources that spoke to my experiences. This absence of representation resulted in deep-seated shame and isolation that I carried with me for most of my life. That is something no child should have to experience.

The responsibility for what children read should lie with parents, not the legislature. It does not make sense to me that the very folks who champion the values of minimal governmental intrusion are now endorsing a bill that intrudes into personal and parental rights.

This is not just a restriction on library content; it's a direct contradiction of the values of freedom and personal responsibility that we, as Idahoans, hold dear.

Thank you to the committee for allowing me the opportunity to express my opposition to HB710. Our voices must be heard in matters that deeply affect our community and our fundamental rights.

Annie Gaines	H 710	W	Self	Boise	Against	N	22
--------------	-------	---	------	-------	---------	---	----

I'm writing to you about HB710, the library bill. While the publicly stated intent of the bill is good and I agree that libraries should protect children from inappropriate exposure to pornography (and they do!), the fact of the matter is that this is a problem that does not exist. Libraries already have policies in place that govern what materials they collect and how they should be organized in order to best meet the needs of all citizens in their communities. No public or school library would willingly bring harmful pornographic content into their collection, and indeed that is not happening.

What is happening, and what this bill seems to be in response to, is a few people in a community not liking the inclusion of books in a library representing the diverse perspective or lived experience of minority groups in their community. They then challenge the inclusion of those books in their library and when the library decides the books meet the collection development criteria set forth by the community and the elected board, the complainants escalate their demands to try and get their worldview enforced by the government.

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Annie Gaines	<b>cont.</b>						22
--------------	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	----

The beauty of a public library is that is one of the last free spaces where ANYONE in a community should be able to come and feel safe, especially those whose views or experiences are different than the majority of the community they live in.

For example, in North Idaho the novel "Identical" by Ellen Hopkins has been at issue with a few alleging it is "pornographic." It is a novel that depicts from a young woman's perspective the experience of being abused by her father, and the complicated emotions she feels as she debates whether to tell anyone about it. It's a difficult read, for sure, and it may not be for everyone, but it is absolutely not obscene as defined by Idaho law. Additionally, labelling such a novel as obscene is harmful to any young women in the community who have been abused and already feel dirty and evil and wrong because of what was done to them. Preventing them from accessing a book that acknowledges their lived experience would cause them undue harm.

The fact is none of the books that have been challenged in Idaho would meet the legal definition of harmful to minors as defined by Idaho law. The only thing I know of that would is a small collection of Playboy magazine dating back to the 1960s in book storage at the University of Idaho Library. (In case you are curious, here is a link to the catalog record for Playboy magazine in the University of Idaho Library: [https://alliance-uidaho.primo.exlibrisgroup.com/permalink/01ALLIANCE\\_UID/2vsn7u/alma994963601851](https://alliance-uidaho.primo.exlibrisgroup.com/permalink/01ALLIANCE_UID/2vsn7u/alma994963601851))

Jessica Dorr	H 710	IP	Self	Boise	Against	Y	19
--------------	-------	----	------	-------	---------	---	----

Chairman Guthrie, Members of the Committee:

My name is Jessica Dorr, and I am the Director of the Boise Public Library. Like public librarians all over the state, I am committed to providing access and opportunity for everyone in our community.

Today I am here to ask you to vote "no" on House Bill 710. I am asking you to vote "no" on all unnecessary library legislation. As you have heard from previous sessions and hearings, there is no pornography or materials harmful to minors in public or school libraries. And a thorough review process for materials is already in place and overseen by locally accountable library boards.

Libraries in Idaho do not provide obscene materials to children. What we provide is story times for babies and toddlers and school aged kids. We support new parents and families with kids of all ages. We provide tax help through a partnership with AARP, programs for seniors focused on memory care and preventing falls. You can join a Lego club or play pokeman or Bunco. We're building cardboard forts this week at Collister. You can practice German or English or join a knitting club in least three of our locations or read to a therapy dog. And that is about half of what is happening. Just this week – a typical week – at the Boise Public Library, we have more than fifty



Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Jessica Dorr	<i>cont.</i>						19
--------------	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	----

community programs with something for everyone.

I'm asking you to vote "no" on this legislation to let my staff get back to the work we do for the community. I am asking you to vote "no" because library staff are tired of being mischaracterized and questioned and attacked for a problem that does not exist. I am seeing librarians in my library and throughout Idaho leave the profession or leave the state.

When I lose staff, I lose the person who knows your child's name when they come to story time and has set aside a book on their favorite topic. I lose the person who helps your neighbor find a job and keep their home. I lose the person who helps your mother find connection after the death of a spouse. When a librarian is driven out of the profession, a community loses a passionate advocate for reading, learning, and connection.

If a parent or guardian has concerns about age-appropriate content for a minor they should engage each local library's materials review process, not utilize the court system to intimidate staff acting in their professional capacity.

I respectfully ask that you vote "no" on all new and unnecessary library legislation and let me and my staff continue to serve the public.

Thank you.

Wendy Johnson	H 710	W	Self	Nampa	Against	N	13
---------------	-------	---	------	-------	---------	---	----

I am against this bill. By prohibiting certain books from schools is censorship. Some children's only access to certain topics is through libraries and by censoring what some kids have access to you forfeit their freedom and access to a judge-free safe zone. The uproar against certain books is mind boggling, it is a parents job to have conversation with their kids to discuss what is appropriate to read and what isn't. By prohibiting books to libraries is insane. The internet exists and if there is a will, there is a way. It is naïve to think that by banning and prohibiting books children won't find a way to access it. Not to mention what they can find on the internet is ten times worse. I urge you to vote no on this bill. It's invasive to so many people, not just children. Books are expensive and where can an adult be expected to find these books? A library is to serve the public, to serve everyone not just the people we decide can have access to certain books. By prohibiting books you are actively showing the people that you don't care for their freedom of speech (expression), which is a right idaho seems to care greatly for. Again, please vote no.

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
Sydney Tapia	H 710	W	Self	Boise	Against	N	18

Stop trying to categorize reading literacy as dangerous. The facism in bills like this is what is really dangerous. These attacks on people of color and Igbt people with the lie that it's protecting kids is ridiculous. Bills like this that create made up problems in order to demonize and ban the existence of marginalized people need to stop. You should be embarrassed for not working on legislation that helps people. The minimum wage is still 7.25 which just makes the housing and homelessness issues worse. How is banning books the top of your priorities?

Mary DeWalt	H 710	IP	Self, librarian	Boise	Against	Y	19
-------------	-------	----	-----------------	-------	---------	---	----

Good morning, Mary DeWalt, District 19, representing myself. I oppose and appreciate the opportunity to address misperceptions. We hear engaging with a library via existing policy and procedure hasn't worked, and the threat of civil action is the only recourse. This is likely because 1) the person never engaged at all, instead complaining socially instead of communicating directly, or 2) the person who attempted to engage did not like the answer they received, that the item in question was indeed accessed and shelved in accordance with local policy and Idaho law as it would have passed the Miller Test. Libraries respect the individual and family values of community members but have a responsibility to ensure there are materials that meet the needs and interests of people with diverse values. While an item may have one paragraph or image that someone may find offensive, the work on a whole has value. Materials are shelved by age relevance. A seven-year old is not going to have interest in a 300-page teen book. A 16-year old who seeks out an adult novel and gets through to one paragraph with a sexual reference will comprehend that paragraph in the context it is intended. There is a reason the Supreme Court adopted the Miller test for obscenity including a key component "appeals on the whole to prurient interests." Like the saying "do not judge a book by its cover," the Miller Test ensures that no one word, image, or paragraph from a book makes it obscenity. Libraries do have some materials with nudity or sexual references, mere presence does not make an item obscene. A picture book showing two women holding hands, is in no way appealing to prurient interest, yet under this bill someone could call that book obscene and file on it. Sponsors gloss over this, saying it just needs to be moved, that's all. What if it doesn't deserve to be moved, but the objecting party disagrees? Libraries will have to go through an unwarranted legal process. Sponsors state if obscene materials don't exist what is the problem with the bill? The problem is perception. The problem is that there are people who may feel so strongly about an item that they would attempt to force relocation to adults only under civil action threat. And should the library deem the item to have been in the right location, they will need to spend taxpayer money proving it.

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Mary DeWalt	<i>cont.</i>						19
-------------	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	----

Context and the Miller test is vital. Better communication is what is needed, not a new law.

Danielle Blumhardt	H 710	W	Self	Garden City	Against	N	19
--------------------	-------	---	------	-------------	---------	---	----

I am against this bill that attempts to codify censorship. I am against the political scapegoating taking place that attempts to silence different viewpoints, take books out of our libraries, and tries to bully small rural libraries via fines and the law. This is inherently anti-freedom and is based upon fear and hatred, not trying to make our state better.

Katie Wheeler	H 710	V	Self	Meridian	Against	Y	20
---------------	-------	---	------	----------	---------	---	----

I am against house bill 710. Like the vast majority of Idahoans, who have testified before me, I am against this, and all censorship legislation. We do not need these laws. We do not need the government to tell us what our children can, and cannot access. We trust in the libraries, and we trust that they are doing the best job to curate their collection. If a parent does not want their child to access material, it is that parent job to keep the material away from their child. It is not the legislature job to find libraries and bankrupt Idaho's small libraries. I Oppose this legislation.

Amy Armstrong	H 710	W	Self	Boise	Against	N	16
---------------	-------	---	------	-------	---------	---	----

I am against this bill as a middle school librarian for many reasons. My main concern is that the bill has no room for communication and collaboration between the school and the person who has decided a book is considered 'harmful'. If a person deems it 'harmful', there is no discussion, no paperwork, no accountability. If the school doesn't remove the book or place it in an 'adult section' then the school can be fined and sued. There are serious issues with the way this will play out. School districts already have procedures and processes in place. In my 16 years as a school librarian, I have had 4 parent concerns.

1. A student was not allowed to read books with demons in them, so we made sure he didn't check out any books like that.
2. A student's parent didn't want her 6th grade daughter reading manga books or books with dating in it. We put that note in our library catalog and helped her find other books she would like to read.
3. A student's parent didn't want her to read dystopian books because it gave her nightmares. After 2 years, the student and parent let me know that she was ready to read dystopian books.
4. A 6th grade student's parent didn't want her daughter to read a book that she felt was too mature for her. I asked her if she wanted to fill out paperwork to challenge it and she said, "No, the book is great and I am reading it right now and I don't want it removed. I just don't think my daughter is ready for that yet".

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
Amy Armstrong	<i>cont.</i>						16

In all the cases, parents and I worked together. This bill will allow any person to have any book removed, and there is no room for discussion. That is not democratic and it is not the voice of the community. It is one voice. Please let library staff do what they are trained to do, and help students find books that fit their family's values and morals. Please don't allow a small minority to require their family values and morals to be the ones followed on the entire state of Idaho.

Angela Flock	H 710	W	Self	Coeur d'Alene	Against	N	4
--------------	-------	---	------	---------------	---------	---	---

Dear Senate State Affairs Committee,

I'm Angela Flock, and I live in Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, (District 4), and I am against H710, the Children's School and Library Protection Act.

I'm the teen librarian at the Coeur d'Alene Public Library, but I'm not sending you this as an official representative of my library. I'm speaking for myself. I just thought that knowing my level of expertise with the subject might help inform your decisions.

H710 will not make good law. It can be used to attack public servants and their institutions. It's vague. It's deeply flawed, and it's unnecessary.

I have watched every Idaho library bill that has been discussed in the Idaho legislature for the last three years. I wonder every time how many legislators have talked to their local library directors and boards about what's actually happening in libraries. (For my library, none of our district's legislators have reached out to discuss our library's current policies.)

The problem is manufactured. I don't know of any libraries in Idaho that have actual obscene material in their collections. I can almost hear one of you saying, 'Well, if libraries don't have obscene materials, then why does a bill like this matter?' It matters because of the chilling effect it will have. It sends a message of intimidation and a lack of trust to public servants that are working diligently--selflessly--in libraries to help their communities with library-related services.

Libraries and their librarians are facing struggles all over the state (and across the nation). I don't know if you've read the New York Times' article, "Cast as Criminals, America's Librarians Rally to their own Defense", but it includes a story from a local teen librarian that was serving in a neighboring Idaho library (right next door to my own), until she received so many personal attacks and threats against

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Angela Flock	<i>cont.</i>						4
--------------	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	---

her family that she found a job out of state. And it was all because she had 'the audacity' to offer a book club for community members who requested it for their LGBTQ+ teens, and while this bill wouldn't directly contribute to this sentiment, there is a group of people in my area, who believe LGBTQ+ (and other 'offensive') materials don't belong in libraries.

A local group of concerned citizens has a website with numerous books displayed from my library's teen collection. They use terms like 'nauseating' and 'cesspool', when they're describing the library's teen collection at library board meetings and in legislative testimony. They have a list of over 900 titles, and the titles that they reference there (from the teen collection) are less than 10% of the nearly 6000 titles in our teen collection. None of the titles on their website (or list) are "harmful to minors", but they believe they are. And they've been trying to intimidate staff and our library board into believing our teen collection is evil somehow.

And the concerned citizens are getting local law enforcement involved. About a year ago, the Kootenai County Sheriff visited the teen section of the Hayden Public Library (a neighboring library to my own) and recorded the experience on his bodycam. Last September, he recounted the experience in a meeting with the public and said that certain books had "sexual explicit content", and he attempted to keep them off the library's shelves. The books were not "harmful to minors"; one was "Deal with it!", a sexual education book, which is something that teens and their parents request on occasion.

These are some examples of the types of intimidation tactics that librarians in Kootenai County in Idaho are facing, and I'm sure there are similar stories from other parts of Idaho, and it's taking its toll.

The ILA's recent survey of its members stated that 60% of those who answered the survey are thinking of leaving the library field, due to proposed library bills (such as this one). This bill will not only fearmonger, making more people think that there's a problem (when there isn't one), it will also cause further harm to Idaho as a whole. Our state's intellectuals will continue to move out of state, and it will become very difficult to recruit well-educated employees for school and public libraries.

Instead of supporting libraries against their attackers, this bill will drum-up more challenges from misguided people, who believe that they have some right to remove constitutionally-protected materials in the name of "protecting the kids", or other bad actors who think all libraries should be defunded or privatized.

To speak directly to this bill, I appreciate the removal of subsection (b) in the 18-1514.6 definition of "harmful to minors". It is an improvement. A further improvement would have been to acknowledge the third part of the Miller Test more. As it currently is in Idaho Code, the Miller Test's protection for materials with "serious literary, artistic, political or scientific value" is tagged onto the end of 18-

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Angela Flock	<b>cont.</b>						4
--------------	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	---

1514.6(a)ii and looks an afterthought, despite its importance for determining obscenity.

Also, it's worth noting that the "value" part of the Miller Test is not mentioned anywhere else in the entire bill. It seems like an oversight. I believe, at the very least, it should be in the affirmative action section (starting on pg 3, line 26). Ruling whether material is "harmful to minors" is actually the court's jurisdiction, but in order to save the court's and libraries' time, it seems logical to emphasize to would-be claimants that material that "when considered as a whole, and in context in which it is used, possesses serious literary, artistic, political or scientific value for minors" is a reason for an affirmative defense. Or simply include something like 'materials that don't meet the definition for 'harmful to minors' is an affirmative defense'.

Also, the bill references "written notice" as the means for the beginning of the 30-day decision period (before litigation), but it's not clear whether that is the "readily accessible form..." (mentioned on pg 3, starting on line 37), or whether any written statement will do. That might seem like a minor detail, but if librarians don't have the ability to direct people to a board-approved form, then the process could be more difficult for library staff to navigate. My library has a well-crafted reconsideration form, for instance, and it deters would-be challengers from frivolous requests by asking deeper questions, such as whether they've read the book in its entirety. These forms are specific to each library, and it's unclear to me whether or not they could still be used under this proposed legislation.

I'm not sure how libraries are expected to handle high-volume requests either. Hypothetically, what if a bad actor submitted hundreds of reconsideration requests? Would all of them be expected to be handled within a 30-day time period? And if so, where would the compensation for staff overtime come from? This bill doesn't seem to recognize that educated staff will have to defend, review, and recommend some sort of decision to the library board in that timeframe. If handled appropriately, one book challenge could take an entire month by itself. (And for anyone who wonders why it would take that long, librarians take intellectual freedom seriously, and we would want to do our best to ensure that the material is handled appropriately, which might involve reading a book in its entirety, researching other litigation regarding the title, gathering professional reviews, etc.) It could be potentially burdensome, and bad actors could easily overwhelm library staff with frivolous requests.

All of this feels so unnecessary though. I wonder if you've considered why the exemption for libraries, schools, and museums was put in Idaho Code in the first place. I believe it was to avoid all of this manufactured drama, keep local control--local--and keep intellectual freedom flowing freely.

Please stop this attack on libraries. Please talk to your local library directors and library boards. Please support libraries--one of Idaho's greatest resources.

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Angela Flock	<i>cont.</i>						4
--------------	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	---

Angela Flock

Maria Essig	H 710	W	Self	Boise	Against	N	19
-------------	-------	---	------	-------	---------	---	----

I am strongly against H 710 for the following reasons:

\* It IS NOT NEEDED. Librarians are professionals who manage the accessibility of materials inappropriate for children as a part of their job. There is NO PORNOGRAPHY in the children's sections of libraries in Idaho. And no single individual has the right to override the librarian's expertise without some recourse.

\* It does a DISSERVE TO OUR CHILDREN. Idaho citizens should have the right to read whatever they want - including children - under the guidance of their parents or guardians. No individual person should be allowed to determine what ALL children can read.

\* It allows parents to SHIRK THEIR PARENTAL RESPONSIBILITY. If a parent believes there are books in the library that his/her child shouldn't read, then that parent should be supervising their child - not shirking their responsibility by demanding that the book be removed and kept away from every child. No single individual has the right to determine what every child can or can't read.

\* It IS UNAMERICAN. This bill allows one single individual to control our libraries. No single individual has the right to determine reading material for EVERYONE ELSE.

\* It is a BOOK-BANNING BILL. I don't care what what this bill is labeled or called - it is designed to ban books. Free societies of free people DO NOT BAN BOOKS.

Tylor Johnson	H 710	W	Self	caldwell	Against	N	11
---------------	-------	---	------	----------	---------	---	----

I am against this bill because it prohibits free speech and encourages censorship. Book bans have always been done for one reason. Hate. The hatred of learning, the hatred of difference, the hatred of freedom. Banning books encourages a sense of uneducated ignorance amongst Americans. Any person who votes in support of this bill are complicit in the destruction of education and learning in the state of Idaho. Be better and don't vote this fascist bullshit in.

Elna Albano	H 710	W	Self	Boise	Against	N	19
-------------	-------	---	------	-------	---------	---	----

I am against House Bill 710 for a multitude of reasons. This bill imposes the will of one person across a library's entire patronage by allowing any individual to protest the content of a book and request that it be removed or relocated. This would place undue burden upon libraries which already have policies in place to protect vulnerable groups from viewing material that might be deemed inappropriate for them. And that is to say nothing of the blatant and outright homophobic wording of the bill itself, which allows anyone

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Elna Albano	<i>cont.</i>						19
-------------	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	----

to deem homosexual content as "inappropriate" or pornographic. This furthers harmful stereotypes against our neighbors in the LGBTQIA+ community.

After my mother helped to create a small, grassroots public library in the community I grew up in, I've been a lifelong, enthusiastic reader. All throughout my childhood, my parents knew what I was reading; sure, some of it might have been a bit above my age range - but I knew I could ask questions and learn from the pages. The early freedom to read without arbitrary restrictions has given me the ability to think openly and beyond the reaches of my own lived experience as an adult. It is a parent's responsibility to monitor what their own children are reading without treading on the rights of other parents to deem what is appropriate for their own children.

Passing this bill would severely limit the beautiful wellspring of knowledge that public libraries are, and hobble the already-minimal resources that many libraries in our state already have. Allowing one upset parent or patron to dictate the experience of the entire patronage does not allow liberty: rather, it takes freedom away from our rights to choose the material that we ourselves, and our children, consume.

Chelsea Major	H 710	W	Self	Meridian	Against	N	21
---------------	-------	---	------	----------	---------	---	----

My family is against bill 710. This is yet another unnecessary and unconstitutional bill that attempts to take away personal freedoms. It is unnecessary because we have great libraries and trained librarians that provide appropriate books to our community. Our community has varying interests and beliefs and that makes for a more vibrant space. We kindly ask you oppose this bill.

Rebecca Leber-Gottberg	H 710	W	Self	Boise	Against	N	18
------------------------	-------	---	------	-------	---------	---	----

Vote No on HB 710

My name is Rebecca Leber-Gottberg and I am a resident of Ada County. I am a college History professor and work at a local small business. As an educator and Idaho resident, I believe that it is important that we have access to all kinds of stories through our libraries and I oppose HB 710 because it limits access to books and stories that represent our population in the United States. Additionally, this bill addresses a problem that simply does NOT exist.

We also need to address the punitive nature of HB 710. Although it is a drastic reduction in financial penalty from HB 314 brought forward in 2023, it is the same faulty bill as HB 384 in different packaging.



Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
Rebecca Leber-Gottberg	<b>cont.</b>						18

The fact that anyone can sue the library for not removing any book without utilizing the already established review standards and process is ludicrous. This bill is vague and punitive. Not only does HB 710 not give libraries any recourse to address the book in question, this bill is litigious and frivolous.

HB 710 also places undue financial burden on libraries to set up, maintain, and manage an "Adults Only" section of the library. Many of Idaho's libraries are small and are financially on the margin to begin with. This policy, although less than HB 314, is still financially burdensome and could be detrimental to the existence of the library at all. This is an unfunded mandate that will bankrupt many of our local libraries. As it stands, nearly 25% of Idaho does not have access to a public library or library district. Passing HB710 will make that percentage even higher.

Since 2017, Idaho has paid over \$11,000,000 of taxpayer money in lawsuits regarding legislation that has been taken to court. \$11,000,000. If HB 710 passes, then it will only add to the \$11,000,000 that the state has paid from MY and every other resident's taxes when it goes to court.

In this day and age, when we are unable to fund school infrastructure, adequate and accessible healthcare, affordable housing, and vital infrastructure projects, passing legislation which will end up costing the state even more taxpayer money in settlements is irresponsible and reprehensible. Rather than focusing on meeting the needs of Idaho citizens with Idaho tax dollars, bills such as HB 710 are nothing but smoke and mirrors preventing the legislature from addressing real and meaningful needs of the population. They are fiscally irresponsible and damaging to the financial position of the state.

Vote No on HB 710 and focus on the real and tangible needs of Idaho citizens rather than setting the legislature up to pay out more settlements and damages from bad legislation. Isn't \$11,000,000 enough? Imagine what that money could have done to improve the lives of Idaho citizens who really need it.

Thank you for your time and consideration,  
 Rebecca Leber-Gottberg  
 83716

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
Vickie Fadness	H 710	W	self	Lewiston	Against	N	7

Oppose HB710

House sponsor, Crane(12), testified the Miller Test would be used to decide the location of books. But the truth is, HB710 does NOT even mention the Miller Test.

HB710 gives control to "Any minor, parent, or legal guardian" regardless of residence, may request relocation of ANY book or media they believe to be "harmful." HB710 provides no opportunity for community members to disagree with or learn of relocations.

HB710 is government overreach and intrudes on thousands of children's 1st amendment right to browse libraries.

Fining librarians \$250, subject to "unspecified damages and/or injunctions" criminalizes librarians for doing their job - providing books to patrons. 710 is a legislative tool for those holding extreme ideological beliefs on both the right and the left to silence cultures, science, music, literature, art, which offends one person (Hitler, KKK, White Nationalists).

How is science, the arts, literature, social studies, geography – any subject – taught with books in the "adult" section?

Libraries provide free access to on-line audio books. It is impossible to relocate those books.

Finally, it is the parents' responsibility to set family standards, expectations, and consequences for their children, not the state's responsibility, not librarians. We are not a nanny state. There is a process to use.

Thank you

Vickie Fadness

3515 Peach Tree Ln

Lewiston, Idaho 83501

District 7

Jody Broatrom	H 710	W	self	Salmon	Against	N	31
---------------	-------	---	------	--------	---------	---	----

The public library in my town of Salmon provides a vital resource for those of us in this remote community. Many use online resources to find jobs, apply for advanced schooling and training, file taxes, and more. Many don't have the resources to buy books, as it has been suggested as a "simple solution". I am a senior citizen, I rely on the library to get my reading materials. It is unrealistic to force the library to reconfigure the space to accommodate the few who may find any materials objectionable. It is not the right of a few individuals to dictate access to any materials. They can simply avoid them, and parents or guardians of minors can provide guidance for their own kids, not all kids. Stop regulating free choice of all, punishing patrons and staff, and taking my right to read what I want to. Vote NO on HB710.

<b>Name (First &amp; Last)</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Manner Testifying</b>	<b>Representing Company/Organization</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>For / Against</b>	<b>Wish to Testify</b>	<b>District #</b>
Scott Funk	H 710	W	Self	Lewiston	Against	N	7

Let’s dive into the debacle that is HR 710. This piece of legislation is a perfect storm of governmental overreach and misguided intentions.

Firstly, let’s address the elephant in the room: HR 710’s penchant for fostering lawsuits like a gardener tends to their prized roses. By incentivizing litigation over peaceful resolution, this bill does nothing but throw gasoline on an already raging inferno. Lawsuits are not a solution; they’re a symptom of a broken system. They escalate tensions, drain resources, and achieve little beyond lining the pockets of attorneys.

But wait, it gets better—or worse, depending on your perspective. HR 710 doesn’t stop at public libraries; it extends its intrusive tentacles into the realm of private school libraries. The audacity! Can the legislature even pass a law regarding the contents of private libraries? The very notion reeks of governmental overreach and tramples on the sacred ground of intellectual freedom.

And let’s not forget the sponsors’ claim that HR 710 aligns with the Miller Test. What a laughable assertion! The bill conveniently omits a crucial component of the test—the evaluation of a work’s value. By cherry-picking elements of the Miller Test, HR 710 reveals itself as nothing more than a wolf in sheep’s clothing, masquerading as a protector of decency while trampling on the First Amendment.

In conclusion, HR 710 is a misguided mess that prioritizes litigation over resolution, meddles where it has no business, and falls short of even the most basic legal standards. It’s time to toss this bill where it belongs: in the dumpster of legislative failures.

Timothy Remaley	H 710	W	Self	Boise	Against	N	15
-----------------	-------	---	------	-------	---------	---	----

I write in strong opposition to HB710, and its efforts to suppress the free and equitable flow of information in schools and libraries. The First Amendment protects the right to share ideas -- which includes educators' and students' right to receive and exchange information and knowledge. This bill, in prohibiting specified content, is essentially an outright ban on certain materials. I am particularly concerned that the most commonly banned books throughout our nation's history have a disproportionate impact on the history and lived experiences of women, people of color, LGBTQIA+ people, indigenous cultures, and religious minorities, and that they have the effect of censoring discussions around topics of race, gender, and human sexuality.

All students have a right to read and learn free from censorship. Furthermore, I believe that all young people deserve to be able to see themselves and the issues that impact them reflected in the classrooms and in the books they're reading. Book bans in schools and public libraries -- places that are central to our abilities to explore ideas, encounter new perspectives, and learn to think for ourselves ---

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Timothy Remaley	<b>cont.</b>						15
-----------------	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	----

are misguided attempts to try to suppress the rights of young people.

This bill also has a negative impact on our state's highly regarded value of local control. Our school districts and public libraries are ultimately governed by boards and trustees that are elected by constituents, or are appointed by duly-elected local government officials. Concerns related to content provided by these facilities, and their age-appropriateness, are rightly addressed through the channels already available to us as citizens.

Finally, given that this bill impinges on first amendment rights of speech and expression, there is a high probability that HB710 -- much like many other bills being considered in this legislative session -- will ultimately be litigated in the courts. I am gravely concerned by the mounting legal fees and additional financial burden that the pursuit of bills like HB710 will place on the shoulders of taxpaying Idahoans.

I urge the committee to vote no on this bill, and to put this issue to rest once and for all.

Nicholas Fisk	H 710	W	Self	Boise	Against	N	22
---------------	-------	---	------	-------	---------	---	----

This bill is the antithesis of what the Republican Party of Idaho. Government has no place restricting access to books. Parents should bare the ultimate responsibility and decision making. Due to the broad and vague language in this bill it will create a significant burden on libraries that will have consequences that cannot yet be understood.

Those who ban books are never on the right side of history. Drop this political stunt and get back to real work.

Audrey Gates	H 710	W	Self	Sandpoint	Against	N	1
--------------	-------	---	------	-----------	---------	---	---

I am against this bill. This is unfunded, a bounty bill meant to bankrupt libraries. The sentence on line 47 "Any other material that is harmful to others." is far too broad. For example, a local anti-LGBTQIA group in Kootenai County, has created a list of 950+ books in their library network that they disagree with, well over 50% of the books on that list are on there just because there is a gay character. For example, books like Tea Dragon Society by Kay O'Neill, Captain Underpants, and Goldie Vance are on that list, with the reasoning being gay characters exist in the books. Once this bill passes, they will be able to submit claims that these book are harmful to their bigoted ideas, and since there is no review process for the library to use built into bill, the library can't refute these books being "harmful" and must just remove them. I can see our library turning into an entirely locked building because not everyone agrees with every idea, no matter how non-harmful.

This bill should not be passed as it is currently written.

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Karen M. Hansen	H 710	V	Self	Viola	Against	Y	6
-----------------	-------	---	------	-------	---------	---	---

I strongly oppose HB~710.

Lipstick on a pig doesn't help much.

I am angry at seeing this issue come up repeatedly this year.

The outside funded Idaho Freedom Foundation (IFF), better known as the Idaho Anti-freedom Foundation, and the extremist controlled Idaho Republican Central Committee (IRCC) have been kicking Idaho's libraries around long enough.

I am very tired of hearing that our school and public libraries are dens of iniquity and purveyors of pornography. It is simply not true.

We must protect the freedom of local communities to manage their own affairs. We must protect the freedom to read.

This bill incentivizes expensive, disruptive lawsuits. It gives community outsiders or disgruntled individuals power to harass and intimidate libraries. That is completely uncalled for.

Our rural and small town libraries are vital community resources that could easily be shut down through repeated lawsuits over good faith decisions.

I have family that live on a ranch in a remote area. One of the only community resources is the local library. The mother, daughter and son are extremely bright people who love the resources at their small local library. It has been extremely valuable to my young grandson who has been under a lot of stress. He is an avid reader and the local library has been a refuge for him and a real blessing to his mom.

PLEASE, do NOT let the extremists take this away from them! Lawsuits will kill this library!

Our towns and communities take good care of their libraries and do not need the legislature intervening and criminalizing issues that the local community is fully capable of handling alone. I ask the legislature, yet again, to back off.

Vote Against HB~710

Judy Halverson	H 710	W	self	Boise	Against	N	17
----------------	-------	---	------	-------	---------	---	----

To the Chairman Guthrie and members of the Senate State of Affairs Committee:

My name is Judy Halverson, I live in Boise and am a member of United Women in Faith. My faith teaches me to be respectful and appreciate diversity in my community. This library bill HO710 is another hurtful bill that I've seen come up in this Legislative session that targets people who are homosexual.

Under the heading "Obscene Materials --Definitions", #3 includes in the listing of "sexual conduct", "homosexuality". Homosexuality is not "obscene"! You may have a faith that teaches you that, but my faith does not teach me tht homosexuality is obscene conduct.

This is where separation of the sate and church is so important. Your personal faith values do not negate my personal faith values.

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Judy Halverson	<i>cont.</i>						17
----------------	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	----

We have laws in our country to protect our freedoms of religion--mine and yours.

The local library can determine appropriate books for appropriate ages and parents have the responsibility to determine what books they want their children to read. State government laws like HO710 is not needed in Idaho. Please vote no on HO701.

Thank your for consideration,

Judy Halverson

431 S. Curtis Rd.

Bosie, ID 83705

Robert Bailey	H 710	V	Self	Moscow	Against	Y	6
---------------	-------	---	------	--------	---------	---	---

House bill 710 is entirely unnecessary. No real emergency exists, a point which I can verify querying any freshman high school class I teach. No student of mine expresses anxiety regarding library- or classroom-materials, and no student considers these materials as sources for sexual gratification. The very idea is laughable. It would depend on the most renegade students possessing a desire to read (which they do not), combined with the sudden disappearance of all mobile phones and other technology better suited to enable illicit access. The suggestion that teachers and librarians are secretly attempting to seduce or otherwise contaminate their students' morals is not only laughable but deeply insulting--yet that is the conviction underlying this and all previous bills about obscenity in Idaho.

The phrase 'Notwithstanding any other provision of law' (page 2, line 35) is the boldest affront to statutory restraint in the whole bill. Evidently, no legislation (perhaps not even the caveat in lines 7-11 above) should make available 'any picture, photograph, drawing... depict[ing] nudity...that is harmful to minors.' If this last criterion ('harmful to minors') is intended to recall the protections of literary, artistic, political or scientific value in 6.b.ii, why make the connexion so perilously indirect? If it is not so intended, then no protection remains, and the agenda of this bill's sponsors becomes clear: to label sexuality as categorically impure, and to render knowledge of any alternatives to the conservative model of human life unavailable to anyone under 18.

The comfortable assumption that an 'average person, applying contemporary community standards' or that 'prevailing standards in the adult community' should simplify whether someone has violated the law is equally ridiculous. Average people can combine in a jury to establish the facts of a case, but cannot combine to establish the facts of aesthetics, which do not exist. Instead, this is a transparent attempt to mask particular designs under the appearance of general consensus. Conservatives sponsoring this bill are content to base their legitimacy on imaginary 'average people' whose 'prevailing standards' are conveniently identical to their own. Really, however, the ideas in this bill are not those of average people (much less average students), but rather the demands of conservative zealots eager to remake society in their own image.

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
Robert Bailey	<i>cont.</i>						6

Finally the indemnities: \$250 in statutory damages plus unspecified (read, unlimited) additional damages per plaintiff. Let me ask what new teacher will risk defending his curriculum on the slippery ground of artistic or scientific value when the risk of lawsuits and injunctions (read, terminations) is so concrete? Yet when did education become a game of chicken between teachers and government? Since when should teachers have to balance the danger of attracting lawsuits against the danger of leaving students ignorant and naive? Aren't we all trying to build a responsible and thoughtful next generation? How is that possible when the mere representation of the human form is deemed so vile, so revolting, that its appearance merits an indictment? Self-knowledge precedes all other knowledge, yet no one explores what brings one shame. The only people contaminating the morals of Idaho's youth are those writing legislation like this, which sews distrust where confidence and self-love should remain secure.

The unharnessed enthusiasm of Representative Crane, Senator Foreman and others in Idaho's radical right to promote 710, 314 and 666 should be confronted for what it is: an anti-pluralist, sectarian and ultimately fascist impulse. We can do better than this. Burn this bill on the pile of horse-turds just like it. Vote NO on H710.

R. Todd Bailey  
 Language & Performing Arts Teacher  
 Drama Director  
 Moscow High School  
 Moscow, Idaho

Huda Shaltry	H 710	IP	Myself and as the Legislative Co-Chair for the Idaho Library Association	Boise	Against	Y	16
Testimony of Huda Shaltry Oppose House Bill 710 Before House State Affairs Committee March 19, 2024							

Good morning, Chair Guthrie and members of the Senate State Affairs Committee. My name is Huda Shaltry and I live in Boise, Idaho. I'm speaking for myself, as a mother, a librarian, and as the Legislative Co-Chair for the Idaho Library Association and I oppose HB 710.

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
Huda Shaltry	<i>cont.</i>						16

I really don't feel like there is anything that I can say about this bill that you haven't already heard, but I would like to talk to you about how my career has been affected by the multiple library bills and the rhetoric that has circled around these bills. I have been told that I give porn to five-year-olds. These statements have been said to my face by legislators. Last July, a person came into my library branch that I manage and threw a book at my staff calling them pedophiles. Their reaction was to protect the children there (and their families) from this man. He did not go through procedures, he did not decide not to come back to the library, he threw a book at human beings doing their job.

Not all of it has been bad. Honestly, most of it has been loving and kind and supportive. Every week I have people apologizing to me for having to endure these attacks. Every week I have someone thanking me for the library's existence and resources and books that look like their families or loved ones. We all know that we can get 100 positive interactions but that one fella that throws a book at your employees is really going to stand out.

The rhetoric behind these library bills have already created a chilling effect on our institutions. Passing HB710 will only make that chilling effect worse. Right now, there is a school district in Idaho that has a list of 48 books that they will remove from their high schools based on the outcome of this bill. Books on this list include, Perks of Being a Wallflower, Water for Elephants, and Kite Runner. All these books have been made into movies that are PG-13!

We have procedures in place, we have locally-elected board members that oversee these procedures. A private-right of action creates a chilling effect and is a waste of taxpayers money. For all of these reasons, I urge you to please vote no on HB 710. If you have any questions about my position on House Bill 710, please contact [idaholiberaliesadvocacy@gmail.com](mailto:idaholiberaliesadvocacy@gmail.com). Thank you.

Respectfully,  
Huda Shaltry



<b>Name (First &amp; Last)</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Manner Testifying</b>	<b>Representing Company/Organization</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>For / Against</b>	<b>Wish to Testify</b>	<b>District #</b>
Nick Grove	H 710	IP	Self and Meridian Library District	Meridian	Against	Y	21

Hello members of the Committee,

This bill is not only unnecessary, it is also a patently offensive and dangerous assault on our fundamental rights and freedoms. This bill copies many of the failed tactics of legislative bodies across the country that have passed in a partisan culture attack that has consistently been overturned in court. In Meridian we faced a petition to dissolve our library district in 2023 from a group using book lists, talking points, and legal guidance from groups seeking to silence people of color and people of the LGBTQIA+ community. Not only did the Meridian community vociferously reject the idea of dissolving our award winning library, they voted in the incumbent library trustees and the city council and mayoral candidates who support libraries. These were not close elections. Our library district opened a new library branch in May 2023 and broke ground on another in October 2023. These projects are part of the plant facility levy passed by Meridian voters in 2019 and have been made possible due to two amazing private-public partnerships.

The Meridian Library District is the largest library district in Idaho. We own over 200,000 items and have an annual circulation of almost 1.5 million. This year our library is celebrating 100 years of public library service in Meridian. Before 2022 we had a handful of items that went through the request for reconsideration process. Since then we have had 13 items challenged and every single item was challenged because of LGBTQIA+ themes, characters, or portrayals.

This bill creates a bounty program on libraries across Idaho. The Meridian business community has been extremely vocal in opposing any bounty program where citizens use private right of action to bully public agencies. The mechanisms described in this bill make it so libraries are required to do what the requester is seeking or face the ramifications of the bounty program. Libraries cannot make decisions based on professional expertise and community needs, they are instead forced to do the bidding of those who seek to see the silence of voices and experiences are not like theirs.

The consequences of this bill will be dramatic. Libraries will have to decide whether to support the literary wants and needs of their community or acquiesce to the demands of the people seek to censor materials not to their liking. Our libraries do not have adult only sections. We do have sections for adults, teens, and children collections. Libraries will be forced to hire bouncers and ID everyone who wants to come into our branches. Children and teens will not be permitted to visit a library without a parent or guardian. We will not be able to partner with childcare facilities, schools, or community organizations serving children.

This bill is censorship. Under this bill, as a parent, I will not be able to make library choices for my children unless they pass the purity test of the culture warriors. I talk to my children about these issues and they fully understand that I can tell them what to read or not read but that other people do not have that right. Please reject this bill and the overreaching effort to censor books. This is a bad

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Nick Grove	<i>cont.</i>						21
------------	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	----

solution for a problem that doesn't exist.

Respectfully,  
 Nick Grove  
 Library Director  
 Meridian Library District

Sheri Gress	H 710	W	Self	Meridian	Against	N	21
-------------	-------	---	------	----------	---------	---	----

HB710 stands to cause irreparable damage to our library system with no real, tangible, benefit to minors. This bill attempts to restrict access to published materials well beyond the "contemporary community standards" dictated by the language of the bill and defined in the Miller test for obscenity as established in 1973. This bill is vague, overreaching, and unhelpful, and is a significant waste of resources. It places a financial, staffing, and infrastructure burden on all libraries without providing any funding to support these changes and does not provide any means for libraries to dispute any claims made through the proposed "universal complaint form". As written, HB710 demands compliance with any requests to restrict materials with no functional limitations. While the bill contains caveats for material with overall value despite potentially objectionable content, it does not provide any mechanism to challenge claims submitted using the proposed form. It places libraries in the position of having to justify materials which have already undergone extensive review and been confirmed as meeting "contemporary community standards", and risk penalties each and every time anyone submits a claim form without any requirements for those claims to meet the requirements of the bill. It is openly discriminatory not just in content, but in application, as it directly conflicts with the purpose of school and public libraries to serve ALL Members of their communities equally. As both school and public libraries are primarily funded by taxpayer money, you are asking us as taxpayers and library users to fund an extremist minority's assumptions about books and materials, overriding the library board's existing review process, the librarians' training and knowledge, and parental management of our own children. This bill is, frankly, a waste of public time and resources duplicating an effective existing process following contemporary community standards. What this bill proposes does not support those community standards, but in fact attempts to impose the whims of an extremist minority upon our community as a whole, and at community expense. Please vote no on HB710.

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
Samantha Venable Harjo	H 710	V	Self	Mountain Home	Against	Y	8

As a former trustee for my local library board, I have extensive knowledge of the collection, budget, and the difficulties and frankly, impossibilities this legislation would place on rural and underfunded library staff and administration to abide by this overreach. Library patrons and their families are welcome to utilize the library services as they see fit for their own family needs and values, and should not infringe of the rights and values of others to do the same. The same legislation that would censor and limit materials for families who may look differently than your own, is the same legislation that would censor and remove biblical texts from the collection. It isn't a far stretch of the imagination that someone may feel offended by the Bible being on the public library shelf. If that is not the intended outcome, I strongly suggest you reconsider your approach. If those of you supporting this bill had spent time in a public library actually observing the thousands of families who appreciate and support the library instead of creating a solution for a problem that doesn't exist, we wouldn't be wasting precious tax payer dollars on this non issue. I would like to remind this board that a library is the most local and accessible representation of our constitution, and to begin to censor and limit our access is to whittle away at the very constitution you so fiercely defend. Can we please spend your valuable time on more critical and concerning subjects to Idahoans than censoring and restricting libraries you have continued to grossly underfund?

Thank you,  
Samantha Venable Harjo

Kara Claridge	H 710	T	Self	Coeur d Alene	For	Y	4
---------------	-------	---	------	---------------	-----	---	---

Good morning Chariman Guthrie and Committee -

My name is Kara Claridge and I support HB710. I live in Coeur d'Alene, district four, with my family. I have five kids and have used the libraries with them for years. Over the last few years I have observed a decline in quality books for them in the children's section but as they've gotten older it's taken a dramatic, nauseating turn in the teen section to the point where we now primarily put specific books on hold to pick up. It's too risky to just wander around looking. Which maybe sounds dramatic, but why would I want them exposed to suicide, rape, witchcraft, graphic depictions of sex acts and obscene materials which are always prominently displayed at eye level.

I have given periodic public comment to the CDA library board, which is appointed by the city council and mayor, for over two years now and am largely dismissed for my concerns. As our Kootenai county sheriff brought up recently, these materials are so offensive that if it wasn't for the exemption in place for libraries it would be a crime to distribute these kinds of materials to minors. So in my opinion, giving parents some kind of recourse to sue the institution (not the librarian personally) for damages is appropriate to help curb the

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Kara Claridge	<b>cont.</b>						4
---------------	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	---

inflow of this disgusting material.

Using existing laws which describe the limitations for what's available to minors is not book banning or censorship as is often shouted. And it's not limiting free speech or the flow of ideas. Parents usually assume that areas marked children or teens is going to be safe and right now in my experience it's anything but that. I think this bill will go a long ways in putting healthy boundaries back in place. Thank you for your time and God bless you all.

Dylan Goldade	H 710	W	Self	Boise	Against	N	16
---------------	-------	---	------	-------	---------	---	----

Good day Senators.

I am Dylan Goldade. I am representing myself and I am from district 16. I am asking you humble to please oppose this bill: house bill 710.

This language is extremely vague at what it describes as being "harmful to minors." Bad actors can exploit this loophole that would essentially stifle the existing library review processes. What's more, not everyone agrees on what is "harmful to minors" and some parents will absolutely wish for their children to learn about sexual activity in order to have protection from predators Who could otherwise take advantage of children that don't know about the ways adults can exploit them. Simply learning about something is not the same as doing it, or encouraging it.

Once you vote against this overreach Bill and think about its potential ramifications if passed. Please listen to actual librarians.

Thank you

Julianne Donnelly Tzul	H 710	W	ACLU of Idaho	Boise	Against	N	19
------------------------	-------	---	---------------	-------	---------	---	----

Written testimony was submitted via email to the Committee Secretary. Thank you!

Rosann Mathews	H 710	W	Self	Rockland	Against	N	28
----------------	-------	---	------	----------	---------	---	----

I am in opposition to HB710.

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Rosann Mathews	<b>cont.</b>						28
----------------	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	----

This bill is harmful to our libraries and community use. Libraries already have review methods.

This bill will drive librarians from our schools and libraries on the threat of civil action.

I worked in a rural school library and we did have methods in place for this. Parents were very involved in their children's library selections. If they had any questions they talked to the librarians and we resolved them without incident.

Unfortunately those who want this bill are trying to ban books that are harmless. This is another cause to void certain members of Idahoans and our history.

This bill is a waste of taxpayer dollars and I for one don't want my taxes being used for this type of legislation.

Vote no on this legislation.

Rebecca Evans	H 710	W	self	star	Against	N	10
---------------	-------	---	------	------	---------	---	----

I am against censorship of books. I am a Jew. I am a disabled Veteran. I am a single mother. I am the mother of an adult son who is disable, who I take care of. I've lived in Idaho since 1999. I moved here, thanks to the military. I joined the military at the age of 17 after leaving an abusive childhood at 14. Later, I married an abusive man and fled that marriage, here in Idaho, with my three sons. To say that books have saved my life would be an understatement. I was the kid reading with a flashlight under a blanket to escape the violence of my stepfather. I was the woman, writing and reading and sorting out my life and my choices through the diverse and collective voices that crossed borders and boundaries. Books offered me hope. Books offered me an opportunity to feel unalone in my despair.

It is not the library or the school or the bookstore to hold responsible or accountable for what children read. Parent need to participate in their children's upbringing. Parent's can choose to censor their children's access, can remove books from backpacks and their homes, can let the teacher know that their child has restrictions, if need be.

We are a Jewish family. My sons somehow were able to maintain their culture and their kosher diet regardless of what was offered in public and private schools and libraries and bookstores. The "job" of raising my children with my values was set on my shoulders.

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Rebecca Evans

***cont.***

10

Please do not ban, censor, restrict art and free speech and expression. This is our only hope to offer empathy and maintain diversity and identity.

Kevin Phillips

H 710

W

self

Kuna

Against

N

23

I am against this bill that seeks to limit what can be taught to the youth of Idaho. I believe it is an overreach to put legislative restrictions on what information is available to children and what information our youth have access to. We should be empowering parents to provide guidelines to their children, not banning content for all youth indiscriminately.

Valerie Ward

H 710

W

Self

Boise

Against

N

22

This bill is in direct opposition to the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States® Freedom of Speech. It should NOT be implemented. In addition, it violates the privacy of parents rights.

Amanda Christensen

H 710

W

Self

Emmett

Against

N

14

I am against H710. It includes language that lacks clarity, especially in the statement "any other material harmful to minors". Public libraries already have policies in place for members to submit concerns about books accessible to minors. H710 was opposed by the majority of public testimony when it was in committee, especially by librarians. The people are letting you know that we don't support this. It is your sworn duty to represent us. Vote against H710.

Kara Louie

H 710

W

Self

Meridian

Against

N

20

I am encouraging you all to not send this bill to a full senate vote. The bill is overreaching and puts a bounty on the plates of libraries. Rep. Crane believes that this bill does not ban books because there is an option to move books to a different section. This is not true in the case of school libraries. School libraries cannot have an "adult section" and any book brought would be immediately banned to avoid the attached fee in this proposed law. This fee could literally put school districts in a financial crisis if things are missed. School districts already have so much on their plate getting kids to recover from the learning losses suffered over the past few years, some might choose to get rid of the majority of their library and potentially the certified librarian as well. I want to express my strong opinion that if we are to put more of an emphasis on our state's education policies, damaging or removing recreational reading programs will hinder that goal. There are many studies that say schools with strong school library programs & librarians increase test scores. This should be the emphasis for our students, learning, and school libraries help with this endeavor. The unfunded mandate created in this bill

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Kara Louie	<i>cont.</i>						20
------------	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	----

for libraries in a time when cost of living is increasing drastically, takes away some of the resources available to students in both school and public libraries.

I understand the need of people to be able to challenge materials in their libraries. I am a school librarian and have been through this process. All school libraries have policies like this in place for parents and I am always willing to help individual parents with any concern about the books their child is reading just like classroom teachers will help give alternate assignments for students/parents with objections. The idea that there is so much obscene material in the libraries that we need this law is a fringe idea that we need to stop pushing. There are much better places to put our time and attention on in education that recreational, optional reading materials. Students and parents deserve the right to decide for themselves but not for everyone and with this bill it gives no way for a book to stay once it has been decided to be challenged. This is opening a Pandora's box that will only hurt kids in the long run.

Thank you for your time

Katie Peterson	H 710	W	Self	Twin Falls	Against	N	25
----------------	-------	---	------	------------	---------	---	----

I am a teacher and mother to three young children in Twin Falls Idaho. I am deeply concerned about the proposed bill H710 that would allow for book banning in libraries and schools. This legislation not only threatens our fundamental right to free expression but also undermines the educational and intellectual development of our children. By including the broad language "any other material that is harmful to others" too many books will be taken from our libraries. Allowing book banning sets a dangerous precedent that could lead to further censorship and suppression of alternate viewpoints. These alternate viewpoints are essential for the health of our students. It is no secret that the pandemic negatively impacted the mental health of our Idaho youth. Limiting book accessibility exacerbates that problem for high-risk populations. Almost monthly, I hear reports of young people in my town ending their lives on our Perrine Bridge. Today almost 20% of high school students report thoughts of suicide. (National Alliance on Mental Illness) Indigenous youth and LGBTQ youth have higher rates of suicide than other youth groups. Many banned books center on individuals from these groups. These students need to be supported and to see their stories in literature. It is imperative to their mental health that they feel cared for, loved, and represented. I don't want to hear another story of a young life taken too soon. Parents have a fundamental duty to have a say in what is appropriate for their children to read. However, allowing a select few parents to object to literature for the entire group is tyranny. Library censorship will not make Idaho students safer. It will limit student access to library materials and educational opportunities. Leave library material review to professional librarians.

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Kendra Scheid	H 710	W	Self	Pocatello	Against	N	29
---------------	-------	---	------	-----------	---------	---	----

Limiting access to a wide variety of topics in literature can harm children in several ways:

**Stunted Intellectual Growth:** Exposure to diverse ideas and perspectives is crucial for children's cognitive development. Limiting their access to a wide range of topics deprives them of opportunities to explore different viewpoints, which can hinder their ability to think critically and creatively.

**Narrowed Understanding of the World:** Literature serves as a window to the world, allowing children to learn about different cultures, experiences, and social issues. When access is restricted, children's understanding of the world becomes limited, leading to narrow-mindedness and a lack of empathy towards others.

**Difficulty in Addressing Complex Issues:** Many literary works address complex themes such as identity, diversity, discrimination, and mental health. By censoring these topics, children are denied the opportunity to engage with and learn from literature that could help them navigate these issues in their own lives.

**Missed Learning Opportunities:** Literature offers valuable lessons and insights that can help children develop important life skills such as empathy, resilience, and problem-solving. When certain topics are off-limits, children miss out on these learning opportunities, which are crucial for their personal and social development.

**Suppressed Creativity:** Literature encourages imagination and creativity in children. When access to diverse literature is limited, children's creativity may be stifled as they are not exposed to a wide range of ideas and storytelling techniques.

Overall, limiting access to a wide variety of topics in literature can deprive children of the opportunity to learn, grow, and develop into well-rounded individuals who are equipped to navigate the complexities of the world around them.

Kalli King	H 710	W	Self	Boise	Against	N	15
------------	-------	---	------	-------	---------	---	----

I am against this bill.

This bill is an overreach of government, as libraries already have systems in place to deal with complaints or concerns about books.



Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Kalli King	<i>cont.</i>						15
------------	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	----

This bill is a waste of tax dollars as libraries funded by them will have to pay fines and deal with law suits, possibly costing thousands.

This bill encourages people to bring forward complaints about books they don't like or deal with subjects that make them uncomfortable, even though they benefit other people from different backgrounds.

I strongly urge you to vote no on this bill.