

Chair Roegner, Ranking Member Hicks-Hudson, and members of the Senate Oversight Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to testify today. My name is Gary Greenberg. I am a thirty year plus resident of Southwest Ohio, a retired educator, and a grandfather to six wonderful grandchildren - five of whom live in Columbus. I am strongly opposed to House Bill 68, the ban on gender affirming healthcare for minors.

Let me tell you a short family story. Last year, our daughter and daughter-in-law gave us the heads up about this legislation, then known as HB 454, and let us know that if it becomes law in Ohio, they and our five grandchildren will leave the state. "Of course, she said, we'll take you with us." And we will go. Here's why:

Our oldest grandson is entering middle school next year. Along with all of his terrific academic and social accomplishments, he is also in the care of a therapist for gender dysphoria. Should this legislation pass, it would directly interfere with his relationship with that therapist, with their plan of treatment, and with the relationship between a child, his health care providers and his

parents. That is a profound disruption of a normal childhood, and a setup for anxiety and depression in coming adolescence. As if these challenges were not enough for an 11 year old, our grandson is also a juvenile diabetic.

This bill comes at a precarious time for children's psychological health in this country. Three organizations tasked with guarding children's health, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, and the Children's Hospital Association, declared a National State of Emergency in Children's Mental Health last year. As many witnesses have already pointed out, trans and LBGTQ+ children are at heightened psychological risk compared to others. New Centers for Disease Control and Prevention guidance to schools calls for increased mental health support for these kids, not the denial of support proposed in this bill.

But back to my family story. So here we have a proposed new law in Ohio that would cause three generations of my family to flee the state. And we would be the lucky ones. Our daughter-in-law works in technology and can easily work from a different state. My wife and I are retired and can afford to

move. This won't be the case for the majority of children and families affected by this proposed legislation.

My question is this: Beyond the consequences for my one family and its small family circle - Can Ohio afford to send this profoundly anti-child, anti-family message to all the new employees and families they hope to convince to move to Ohio in the coming years for jobs in organizations like Intel, Semcorp, Honda, CareSource, Wright Patterson Air Force Base, and so many others ?

I urge you to vote against HB68. Thank you again for the opportunity to testify.

Gary Greenberg PhD