

Michelle Cotterman, RN, CNHP
Interested Party Testimony Sub House Bill 435
House Commerce and Labor Committee
October 7, 2021

Chairman Stein, Vice Chair Johnson, Ranking Member Lepore-Hagan and Honorable Members of the House Commerce and Labor Committee, thank you for considering my written testimony as an interested party of Sub HB 435.

My name is Michelle Cotterman. I am a wife, a mother, a registered nurse, and a certified natural health professional. I am a proponent of medical autonomy, privacy, and informed consent. As an “essential frontline worker”, I worked through the early days of the pandemic and am a naturally immunized person. Many healthcare places of employment are not recognizing natural immunity and are requiring immunized employees to receive a COVID-19 vaccine despite scientific evidence showing that natural immunity is long lasting and effective.¹ ² Consider this Cleveland Clinic study demonstrating that individuals previously infected with SARS-CoV-2 do not receive additional benefit from vaccination.³

I am concerned about the future of my two beautiful and perfectly healthy, naturally raised, sovereign children. I am concerned about the discrimination facing our young adults as they face their years in university and entry into the workforce. I am wondering if my children will have a place there or even if they will be considered hireable based on the pharmaceutical products they have declined to consume.

I want a codified law that prevents vaccine mandates, protects medical privacy in all aspects of life, and honors the fundamental human right of prior, free, and express consent.

My greatest concerns with Sub HB435 listed in the order of priority are as follows:

1. Does not prevent COVID-19 vaccine mandates or protect medical privacy in the workplace, higher education, or daycare to 12th grade settings. Provides for exemptions based on medical, philosophical, religious, and natural immunities which essentially codifies a “vaccine passport”.
2. Exemptions in the workplace do not apply to employment that begins after the effective date of the bill.
3. Exemptions in all settings expire in 2023.
4. Medical exemption may only be signed by a primary care provider, not a practitioner.
5. Exemptions do not apply to students or employees in children's hospitals or intensive care or critical care units of a hospital.

¹ *Equivalency of Protection from Natural Immunity in COVID-19 Recovered Versus Fully Vaccinated Persons: A Systematic Review and Pooled Analysis*. (2021, September 21). MedRxiv.

<https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.09.12.21263461v1>

² *Zywicki vs. Washington*. UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA. (2021, August 03).

<https://fingfx.thomsonreuters.com/gfx/legaldocs/zdvxoywrpx/ZywickiComplaint.pdf>

³ Shrestha, N. K. (2021, June 19). Necessity of COVID-19 vaccination in previously infected individuals. Retrieved August 17, 2021, from <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.06.01.21258176v3>

6. There is no provision to prevent discrimination from employees seeking exemptions. An employer could put an employee seeking an exemption on unpaid leave. There is no language to address or prevent this.
7. There is no effective penalty for violation.
8. Does not apply to discrimination in public accommodations. A vaccine could be required to go grocery shopping and this bill doesn't address it or provide any protections against this.

I respectfully ask that the legislative body amend Sub HB 435 to correct the problematic language and protect Ohioans from intrusive government and corporate policies. Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Michelle Cotterman, RN, CNHP