

# Cornerstone Standard Platform Resolutions Packet

## Minnesota: Protecting Children, Parents, and the Family

Prepared for party platform committee submission (and county/district use)

February 3, 2026

Find this document at : <https://cornerstonestandard.com/caucus26>

Take a stand against the mutilation of our children...

<https://cornerstonestandard.com/declarationofpurpose>

### *Minnesota Precinct Caucus Attendees:*

*Thank you very much for planning to attend your local Precinct Caucus on February 3<sup>rd</sup> at 7:00 p.m. You can look up your local caucus location HERE - [Voting Information](https://caucusfinder.sos.mn.gov/) <https://caucusfinder.sos.mn.gov/>*

*Please print and present the following resolutions proposed by the Cornerstone Standard Group to further protect children from harm. (Pages 2-3)*

*Present the Summary page to your local precinct caucus group and ask for their vote of approval. (Pages 5-20)*

*Refer to the additional [CornerstoneStandard.com/caucus26](https://cornerstonestandard.com/caucus26) document to see latest information including further reasoning and details related to each provision within these resolutions.*

**V1.2.1.27.26**

**Cornerstone Standard**



**Protection of Children**

## Cornerstone Standard Resolutions

### to Protect Children from Gender “Affirming” Care – February 3, 2026

**Whereas:** In 2023 Minnesota passed HF 146 making Minnesota a sanctuary state for “gender affirming care” which violates parental rights, the laws of other states, individuals’ first amendment rights (freedom of religion and speech), plus violates medical evidence and harms minors.

**Therefore, be it resolved that:**

**Resolution 1** – The Republican Party of Minnesota support legislation that upholds parental rights and home-state jurisdiction and protects therapeutic choice.

- A. **Uphold parental rights as preeminent** and cannot be stripped due to consciously held beliefs. Ban minor child removal or custody penalties for non-affirmation of gender “affirming” care. Applies to biological, foster, and adoptive parents.  
*(Strengthening our Families and Communities)*
- B. **End “sanctuary” state policies**, especially as it relates to minors regarding gender “affirming” care.  
*(Strengthening the Rule of Law)*
- C. **Protect Therapeutic Choice**, free speech, and faith-consistent counseling for minors and adults.  
*(Preserving our Civil Rights)*

**Resolution 2** – The Republican Party of Minnesota protects minors from irreversible gender medicalization.

- A. Support legislation that requires evidence-based medical standards, informed consent, and parental consent.
- B. Repeal mandated medical insurance coverage for gender “affirming” care.
- C. Criminally prosecute medical personnel who perform non-evidence-based gender therapies.  
*(Preserving our Health Care)*

More Information: <https://cornerstonestandard.com/caucus26>



## Cornerstone Standard Resolutions

### to Protect Children from Sexual Grooming – February 3, 2026

#### Resolution 3 - Protect Children from Sexual Grooming

**Whereas:** Child sexual predators commonly use a patterned process of “grooming” to build trust, establish secrecy, isolate a child, and normalize sexual content before any physical abuse occurs. Existing statutes focus on specific completed acts (solicitation, possession/distribution, criminal sexual conduct).

**Thus, Minnesota must pass a grooming statute to protect minor children (under 18) from sexual grooming.** A grooming statute will give prosecutors an earlier, clearer tool for prosecuting a clear pattern manipulation, especially when adult guardian exploits a position of authority over a targeted child.

- A. **Be it resolved that:** the Republican Party of Minnesota enact a **Minnesota Child Grooming Prevention Act** to create a stand-alone felony charge for grooming a minor child (under 18), which is a patterned course of conduct (online or in-person) used to prepare, manipulate or coerce a minor child (under 18) into sexual exploitation.
- Sample legislation from Montana HB 82 (2025) – creates “Grooming of a Child for a Sexual Offense,” including conduct aimed at a child or the child’s guardian. Recognizes that grooming can occur without a completed meeting or act. Sets graduated felony penalties and adds lifetime supervision/satellite monitoring for the most severe cases (young victims + adult offender).
  - Andrew’s Law (Federal Outline) - Defines grooming as establishing trust/secrecy/control for the purpose of sexual exploitation. Clarifies that an in-person meeting is not required. Includes an undercover/decoy “belief” clause and a close-in-age exemption.  
*(Strengthen Our Families and Communities)*
- B. **Be it Resolved** that Minnesota legislature shall revise all its child protection definitions and laws to consistently define “minor child” as under the age of 18.  
*(Strengthen Our Families and Communities)*
- C. **Be it Resolved** that Minnesota legislators will write/revise laws to strengthen accountability, transparency, and victim rights in all grooming or solicitation cases with minor children under 18.  
*(Strengthen Our Families and Communities)*

For More Information: <https://cornerstonestandard.com/caucus26>



# FULL TEXT RESOLUTIONS ADDITIONAL INFORMATION



Key Minnesota provisions to target (repeal or amend)

**Custody and jurisdiction ("sanctuary" / forum-shopping provisions)**

- Minn. Stat. § 260.925 - Declares certain out-of-state limits on "gender-affirming health care" contrary to Minnesota public policy.
- Minn. Stat. § 518D.201(d) - Treats a child's presence in Minnesota to obtain "gender-affirming health care" as sufficient for "significant connection" jurisdiction.
- Minn. Stat. § 518D.204(a)(3) - Temporary emergency jurisdiction when a child "has been unable to obtain" "gender-affirming health care".
- Minn. Stat. § 518D.207(e) - Limits "inconvenient forum" findings when another state's law/policy limits access to "gender-affirming health care".
- Minn. Stat. § 543.23 - Subpoena restrictions and definitions related to "gender-affirming health care".

**Insurance coverage mandate**

- Minn. Stat. § 62Q.585 - Prohibits health plans from excluding "medically necessary gender-affirming care" and defines "gender-affirming care" broadly.

**Therapy restriction**

- Minn. Stat. § 214.078 - Restricts "conversion therapy" for minors; definition includes efforts to reduce same-sex attractions/feelings or change gender identity.

**Foster care licensing pressure point**

- Minn. R. 2960.3060, subp. 4(E) - Foster care licensing/home study expectations including "respect" for a child's sexual orientation; often used in licensing interpretation and training.

## **[Protect Children from Gender “Affirming” Care]**

### **RESOLUTION NO. 1-A & 1-B (2026)**

#### **TITLE: Restore Parental Rights and Home-State Jurisdiction; End Minnesota "Sanctuary" Policies for Out-of-State Minors Seeking Gender-Affirming Medical Procedures**

**WHEREAS**, God created mankind male and female (Gen. 1:27), established the family (Gen. 2:24; Mark 10:6-9), and charges parents - not the State - with the primary duty to raise and instruct children (Deut. 6:6-7; Eph. 6:1-4).

**WHEREAS**, Minnesota law includes custody and jurisdiction provisions that treat a child's presence in Minnesota to obtain "gender-affirming health care" as sufficient to create a "significant connection" for custody jurisdiction, and authorizes temporary emergency jurisdiction when a child "has been unable to obtain" such care.

**WHEREAS**, Minnesota further declares certain out-of-state limits on "gender-affirming health care" contrary to Minnesota public policy, restricts interstate process related to such care, and limits "inconvenient forum" findings when another state's law or policy limits access to "gender-affirming health care".

**WHEREAS**, Minnesota law and policy have been treated as permitting minors from other states to access "gender-affirming" medical procedures and related services in Minnesota in ways that can undermine parental rights recognized in the child's home state.

**WHEREAS**, Medical decisions for minors should involve meaningful parental involvement, true informed consent, and careful protection against forum-shopping and circumvention of lawful home-state processes.

**WHEREAS**, These provisions invite conflict among the states, encourage forum-shopping, and weaken parents' ability to protect children from irreversible medical pathways.

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, The Party calls upon the Minnesota Legislature to repeal or substantially amend the following provisions to restore the presumption of home-state jurisdiction and parental authority and to prevent Minnesota from functioning as a "sanctuary" forum for minors seeking "gender-affirming" medicalization:

- 1) Minn. Stat. § 518D.201(d) (repeal in full);
- 2) Minn. Stat. § 518D.204(a)(3) (repeal clause (3));
- 3) Minn. Stat. § 518D.207(e) (repeal paragraph (e));
- 4) Minn. Stat. § 260.925 (repeal in full);
- 5) Minn. Stat. § 543.23 (repeal or narrow to ensure lawful interstate process is honored and to prevent protections for minor "gender-affirming" interventions).

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, The Party affirms a platform principle: No parent should lose custody or face "emergency jurisdiction" findings merely because the parent declines to pursue "gender-affirming" medicalization of a minor, provided the parent supplies necessary care, protection, and support.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, The Party calls upon Minnesota courts and agencies to presume that a child's home state retains jurisdiction and that a fit parent's rights and lawful process in the home state should be honored absent clear evidence of abuse or neglect.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, [Optional for county/district use] that copies of this resolution may be forwarded to State Legislators, the Governor, and the State Republican Party.

**References:**

- Minn. Stat. §§ 518D.201(d), 518D.204(a)(3), 518D.207(e), 260.925, 543.23.

## **[Protect Children from Gender “Affirming” Care]**

### **RESOLUTION NO. 1-A (Part 2) (2026)**

#### **TITLE:** Child Welfare Without Compelled Speech: Protect Faithful Foster and Adoptive Homes

**WHEREAS**, James 1:27 commands care for vulnerable children, including those without stable parents.

**WHEREAS**, Minnesota foster licensing rules and home study expectations include requirements commonly interpreted to require applicants to "respect" a child's sexual orientation and to work within agency and state policies.

**WHEREAS**, Children in foster care often come from trauma and need stability, clarity, and adults who will protect them - not pressure them toward irreversible identity/medical pathways.

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, The Party calls upon Minnesota to enact protections ensuring:

- 1) No denial of foster/adopt licensure solely because an applicant holds the belief that sex is binary (male/female) or because the applicant cannot in conscience engage in compelled speech (e.g., pronoun mandates);
- 2) "Respect" in licensing must mean no harassment, no abuse, and provision of basic care - not forced endorsement of contested ideological claims;
- 3) Children should not be placed in homes where adults will demean them; likewise, children should not be denied loving homes because adults will not endorse state ideology;
- 4) Create an explicit religious liberty and conscience clause for foster/adoptive parents and faith-based agencies, while maintaining strict bans on actual abuse and neglect.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, Minnesota should recruit and retain more foster/adoptive families by welcoming qualified faith-motivated families rather than narrowing the pool through coercive policies.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, [Optional for county/district use] that copies of this resolution may be forwarded to State Legislators, the Governor, and the State Republican Party.

#### **References:**

- Minn. R. 2960.3060 (see subp. 4(E) for home study expectations used in practice).



## **[Protect Children from Gender “Affirming” Care]**

### **RESOLUTION NO. 1-A (Part 3) (2026)**

#### **TITLE: Parental Rights Protection Act: No Child Removal or Custody Penalty for Non-Affirmation**

**WHEREAS**, Scripture commands parents to raise children in instruction and discipline (Eph. 6:4) and warns rulers against perverting justice (Isa. 10:1-2).

**WHEREAS**, Parental rights are fundamental and protected by both the U.S. and Minnesota Constitutions, and parents bear the primary responsibility for the upbringing and medical care of their children.

**WHEREAS**, Parents increasingly fear that declining to "affirm" a child's claimed gender identity may be misconstrued as "emotional harm," resulting in investigations, custody threats, or pressure to comply.

**WHEREAS**, Minnesota law and related policy allow for consideration of denial of "gender-affirming care" as a factor in custody and child protection proceedings and other circumstances, chilling the good-faith exercise of parental judgment.

**WHEREAS**, Parents who object to puberty blockers, cross-sex hormones, or sex-trait-altering procedures for their minor children should not face loss of custody or restriction of parental rights based solely on that position.

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, The Party calls upon the Legislature to enact a clear statutory safeguard stating, in substance:

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, "A parent's good-faith decision to decline 'gender affirmation,' to decline puberty blockers/hormones/surgeries, or to teach a child that sex is male or female shall not, by itself, constitute abuse, neglect, or grounds for adverse custody determination, provided the parent supplies necessary care, protection, and support."

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, The Party calls upon the Minnesota Legislature to prohibit the termination or restriction of parental rights based solely on a parent's refusal to consent to "gender-affirming" medical procedures for their minor children.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, Minnesota agencies and courts must treat family preservation as the default and must not substitute state ideology for parental duty.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, [Optional for county/district use] that copies of this resolution may be forwarded to State Legislators, the Governor, and the State Republican Party.

#### **References:**

- Minn. Stat. §§ 518D.201(d), 518D.204(a)(3), 518D.207(e).

## **[Protect Children from Gender “Affirming” Care]**

### **RESOLUTION NO. 1C (2026)**

#### **TITLE: Protect Therapeutic Choice, Free Speech, and Faith-Consistent Counseling for Minors and Adults**

**WHEREAS,** Every adult person has the right to pursue therapeutic goals and choose the outcome of personal therapy according to religious beliefs and/or personal conscience.

**WHEREAS,** The First Amendment protects the free exercise of religion and freedom of speech, including the right to seek and provide counsel consistent with sincerely held religious convictions; and parents have the fundamental constitutional right to direct the upbringing and care of their minor children.

**WHEREAS,** Minn. Stat. § 214.078 defines "conversion therapy" broadly and restricts such practices by licensed practitioners with clients under 18, including efforts to reduce same-sex attractions/feelings or to change gender identity.

**WHEREAS,** Bans written this broadly chill ordinary exploratory psychotherapy, especially when the minor's goals align with family faith commitments, and can create spillover chilling effects on adults seeking similar counseling.

**WHEREAS,** Therapeutic decisions should be made freely between clients, parents (in the case of minors), and licensed practitioners without government interference, and the State should ban only true abuse, coercion, fraud, or aversive practices.

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED,** The Party calls upon the Legislature to repeal or rewrite Minn. Stat. § 214.078 to:

- 1) Ban only coercive, fraudulent, or aversive practices (true abuse);
- 2) Explicitly protect non-coercive talk therapy and open-ended exploration requested by the client, and for minors requested by the minor and parent, including faith-consistent counseling;
- 3) Protect clinicians from discipline for allowing exploration rather than automatic "affirmation," and for respecting the client's stated goals.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED,** The Party affirms that every adult has the right to pursue therapy goals and freely choose therapeutic outcomes according to conscience and religious beliefs.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED,** The Party affirms that parents have the right to direct the care and treatment of their minor children, including therapeutic care, in accordance with their family's values and beliefs.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED,** The Party affirms: Minors deserve help that is compassionate, truthful, and freedom-respecting; and the State should not impose one ideological outcome.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED,** [Optional for county/district use] that copies of this resolution may be forwarded to State Legislators, the Governor, and the State Republican Party.

#### **References:**

- Minn. Stat. § 214.078.

## **[Protect Children from Gender “Affirming” Care]**

### **RESOLUTION NO. 2A (2026)**

#### **TITLE:** Protect Minors from Irreversible Gender Medicalization;

**WHEREAS,** Children are a gift from the Lord (Ps. 127:3), and civil government is ordained to punish wrongdoing and protect the vulnerable, not to replace parents (Rom. 13:1-4; Eph. 6:1-4).

**WHEREAS,** Major systematic reviews have described significant uncertainty and very low certainty evidence regarding key claims about puberty blockers and related pediatric gender medical interventions, raising the need for stronger safeguards.

**WHEREAS,** Children deserve careful psychotherapy, family support, and treatment of comorbid anxiety/depression/trauma.

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED,** The Party urges the Legislature to enact protections including:

- 1) Prohibit surgical sex-trait alteration for minors;
- 2) Prohibit prescription of puberty blockers and cross-sex hormones for minors;
- 3) Require meaningful parental consent and prohibit any state agency from facilitating medicalization of a minor over a fit parent's objection;

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED,** The Party affirms: A child's body is not an enemy to be redesigned; it is part of God's created reality (Gen. 1:27). Compassion never requires affirming falsehood; love rejoices with the truth (1 Cor. 13:6).

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED,** [Optional for county/district use] that copies of this resolution may be forwarded to State Legislators, the Governor, and the State Republican Party.

#### **References:**

- (Use committee-approved references; examples include the Cass Review (UK, 2024) and other systematic reviews assessing pediatric gender interventions.)

## **[Protect Children from Gender “Affirming” Care]**

### **RESOLUTION NO. 2B (2026)**

#### **TITLE:** Repeal Mandated Coverage for Gender-Affirming Care

**WHEREAS,** Minnesota requires that no health plan may exclude "medically necessary gender-affirming care" and defines "gender-affirming care" broadly (including medical, surgical, counseling, and referral services supporting gender identity/expression).

**WHEREAS,** The statute limits insurers' ability to apply medical-necessity definitions more restrictive than the statute's standard.

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED,** The Party calls upon the Legislature to repeal Minn. Stat. § 62Q.585 in full, or at minimum amend it to:

- 1) Exclude minors from any mandated coverage;
- 3) Protect conscience rights for religious employers and plans.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED,** [Optional for county/district use] that copies of this resolution may be forwarded to State Legislators, the Governor, and the State Republican Party.

#### **References:**

- Minn. Stat. § 62Q.585.

## **[Protect Children from Gender “Affirming” Care]**

### **RESOLUTION NO. 2C (2026)**

#### **TITLE: Criminal Accountability for “Gender-Affirming” Medical Interventions on Minors**

**WHEREAS**, Scripture teaches that God created mankind male and female (Genesis 1:27), charges parents to teach and raise their children (Deuteronomy 6:6–7; Ephesians 6:4), and teaches that civil government is God’s servant to restrain wrongdoing and protect the vulnerable (Romans 13:1–4);

**WHEREAS**, on December 18, 2025, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health) issued a public health message stating that HHS’s evidence review concluded the overall quality of evidence for puberty blockers, cross-sex hormones, and so called “transgender” surgeries for minors is “very low,” that available evidence cannot support determinations of effectiveness for improving mental health or alleviating dysphoria symptoms in minors, and that known/plausible risks include infertility/sterility, sexual dysfunction, impaired bone density development, adverse cognitive effects, cardiovascular/metabolic disease, psychiatric conditions, surgical complications, and regret—concluding an “unfavorable risk-benefit profile” for chemical and surgical interventions in minors;

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, The Party calls upon the Minnesota Legislature to enact criminal penalties for any licensed medical professional (or any person acting under color of medical authority) who knowingly provides to a minor (under 18) any “gender-affirming” medical intervention intended to medically “transition” the child—including puberty-suppressing drugs, cross-sex hormones, or sterilizing/irreversible surgeries—except for medically verifiable disorders of sex development or other non-transition medically necessary indications;

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that such legislation should include: (1) felony-level accountability for willful violations; (2) mandatory reporting to the relevant licensing boards; (3) license revocation upon substantiated violation; and (4) appropriate civil remedies for injured minors consistent with due process and existing Minnesota law;

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the Legislature should repeal or amend Minnesota’s “sanctuary” provisions that impede investigation and accountability for these acts—specifically provisions enacted/amended in 2023 Minn. Laws ch. 29 (H.F. 146), including Minn. Stat. §§ 260.925, 518D.201(d), 518D.204(a)(3), 518D.207(e), and 543.23, and related amendments affecting Minn. Stat. ch. 629—**so that Minnesota law no longer shields or prioritizes pediatric medical transition over child protection and parental rights;**

**BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED**, that Minnesota should instead prioritize compassionate, non-invasive care for youth experiencing distress—thorough psychological assessment, treatment of comorbid conditions,

family counseling, and protection from coercion and social contagion—while honoring parents’ fundamental role in their children’s upbringing and well-being.

#### Appendix A: Optional research footnotes (platform-friendly)

- Genetics does not equal destiny: Large-scale GWAS research reports sexuality-related behaviors are complex and not meaningfully predictable from genes; genetic variants account for only part of variation.
- Evidence uncertainty for puberty blockers: Systematic reviews and related summaries report very low certainty evidence and considerable uncertainty regarding key outcomes in youth.
- Insurance mandate definition in MN: Minn. Stat. § 62Q.585 defines "gender-affirming care" broadly and restricts exclusions by health plans.
- MN custody/jurisdiction provisions: Minn. Stat. §§ 518D.201(d), 518D.204(a)(3), 518D.207(e) elevate access to "gender-affirming health care" as a jurisdictional/emergency factor.
- MN therapy restriction scope: Minn. Stat. § 214.078 restricts certain counseling practices for minors under the banner of "conversion therapy."

#### Appendix B: Reference list (for committee packet)

- Minnesota Statutes: §§ 260.925; 518D.201(d); 518D.204(a)(3); 518D.207(e); 543.23; 62Q.585; 214.078 (Minnesota Office of the Revisor of Statutes).
- Minnesota Rules: 2960.3060 (Minnesota Administrative Rules / Revisor of Statutes).
- Cass Review (UK, 2024) - Independent Review of Gender Identity Services for Children and Young People (summary findings include low certainty evidence for puberty blockers).
- Ganna et al., 2019, Science - Large-scale GWAS on same-sex sexual behavior; reports complex genetic architecture and limited predictive value.
- Sutton & Pela (Journal of Human Sexuality) - Article reporting outcomes in psychotherapy related to attraction measures and well-being (field debates exist).

## MN CHILD GROOMING PREVENTION ACT – BILL SUMMARY + CAUCUS RESOLUTIONS

---

### Purpose (what the bill does in plain English)

- Creates a stand-alone felony for \*grooming a minor\*—a patterned course of conduct (online or in-person) used to prepare, manipulate, or coerce a child into sexual exploitation—so law enforcement can intervene \*before\* a meeting or physical abuse occurs.
- Targets common grooming tactics: trust-building, secrecy, manipulation, authority abuse, sexually explicit “normalization,” and arranging in-person meetings.

### Model legislation (what we’re borrowing)

- **\*\*Montana HB 82 (2025)\*\***: creates “Grooming of a Child for a Sexual Offense,” including conduct aimed at a child \*or the child’s guardian\*, and recognizes that grooming can occur without a completed meeting or act. It sets graduated felony penalties and adds lifetime supervision/satellite monitoring for the most severe cases (young victims + adult offender).
- **\*\*Andrew’s Law (federal outline)\*\***: defines grooming as establishing trust/secrecy/control for the purpose of sexual exploitation; clarifies that an in-person meeting is not required; includes an undercover/decoy “belief” clause; and includes a close-in-age exemption (“Romeo & Juliet”).

### Where it fits in Minnesota Statutes (recommended placement)

- Add a new section in **\*\*Chapter 609 (Crimes), Article 5 (Crimes Against the Person)\*\*** near existing child-sex solicitation crimes: **\*\*Minn. Stat. § 609.352A (new) – Grooming of a Minor for Sexual Exploitation\*\***.
- Amend **\*\*Minn. Stat. § 243.166 (Predatory Offender Registration)\*\*** to add the new grooming offense to the list of registerable offenses.

### Core elements to include in a Minnesota grooming statute (draftable language)

- **\*\*Conduct:\*\*** “purposely or knowingly engages in a \*pattern\* of grooming behavior, including in-person or electronic communication, aimed at a minor or the minor’s parent/guardian.”
- **\*\*Intent (any one):\*\*** (1) manipulate the minor into sexual conduct (actual or simulated); (2) coerce/entice a minor (e.g., under 16) to meet in person for sexual conduct; (3) distribute/facilitate access to sexually explicit material to the minor; (4) exploit a position of authority/trust to develop an intimate/secret relationship with the minor.
- **\*\*No-meeting required:\*\*** make clear the crime is complete without physical contact or an in-person meeting.
- **\*\*Undercover/decoy clause:\*\*** allow prosecution when the offender \*believes\* the victim is a minor (including law-enforcement decoys).
- **\*\*Close-in-age guardrail:\*\*** “Romeo & Juliet” exemption for mutually consensual peer relationships (e.g., victim ≥14 and offender ≤2 years older; and no position of trust/authority).

### Penalty structure (Minnesota-appropriate, using the models as a guide)

- Base offense: felony (e.g., up to 10 years).



- Aggravated offense: higher maximum (e.g., up to 20 years) if the offender used a position of trust/authority (teacher/coach/clergy/counselor/medical) OR victim under 16 OR offender distributed sexually explicit material.
- Severe offense: highest maximum (e.g., up to 30 years) if victim under 13 OR the grooming included arranging travel/meeting for sexual conduct OR repeated conduct involving multiple victims.
- Collateral: mandatory no-contact orders; risk-assessment; treatment; and predatory-offender registration as appropriate.

#### Why this matters (talking points)

- Grooming is a \*process\*—the law should address the process early, not only the final act.
- Online communication and encrypted apps make it easier to isolate children and normalize sexual content; a grooming statute is designed for that reality.
- Existing statutes focus on specific completed acts (solicitation, possession/distribution, criminal sexual conduct). A grooming statute gives prosecutors an earlier, clearer tool for patterned manipulation—especially when adults target guardians or exploit authority.

## **[to Protect Children from Sexual Grooming ]**

### **RESOLUTION NO. 3A (2026)**

#### **TITLE: Enact the Minnesota Child Grooming Prevention Act**

#### **WHEREAS,**

- Child sexual predators commonly use a patterned process of “grooming” to build trust, establish secrecy, isolate a child, and normalize sexual content before any physical abuse occurs.
- Modern grooming frequently occurs through electronic communication (text, social media, apps), allowing offenders to manipulate minors rapidly and at scale.
- Montana enacted HB 82 (2025) creating the offense of “grooming of a child for a sexual offense,” recognizing grooming as a distinct, early-intervention crime that can be completed without a meeting or physical contact.
- The Andrew’s Law federal outline defines grooming as establishing trust, secrecy, emotional connection, or control for the purpose of sexual exploitation and likewise clarifies that an in-person meeting is not required.
- Minnesota’s current solicitation statute (Minn. Stat. § 609.352) provides important tools but defines “child” for that section as age 15 or younger, leaving a potential policy gap for older minors and for patterns of manipulation that do not fit neatly into existing offense elements.

#### **THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT**

- Our caucus supports introducing and passing a Minnesota anti-grooming statute creating a new felony offense: **\*\*Minn. Stat. § 609.352A (new) – Grooming of a Minor for Sexual Exploitation\*\*** within Chapter 609.
- The new § 609.352A should define “minor” as under 18; define “grooming” and “electronic communication”; and criminalize a *\*pattern\** of grooming behavior aimed at a minor or the minor’s parent/guardian with intent to manipulate/coerce/entice the minor into sexual conduct (actual or simulated), distribute sexually explicit material, or exploit a position of authority to develop an intimate/secret relationship.
- The new § 609.352A should explicitly state that physical contact or an in-person meeting is not required for the offense to be complete, and should include a belief/decoy clause (offender believes the victim is a minor, including law-enforcement decoys).
- The statute should include a narrow close-in-age (“Romeo & Juliet”) exemption and clear intent requirements to avoid criminalizing ordinary, non-predatory interactions.
- Our caucus urges adding § 609.352A to **\*\*Minn. Stat. § 243.166, subd. 1b\*\*** (predatory offender registration) so that conviction for felony grooming triggers registration and supervision requirements consistent with other child-sex crimes.

**[to Protect Children from Sexual Grooming ]**

**RESOLUTION NO. 3B (2026)**

**TITLE:** Modernize and Align Minnesota’s Child-Protection Definitions and Coverage

**WHEREAS,**

- Minnesota law already recognizes “minor” as under 18 in key child-exploitation statutes (e.g., Minn. Stat. § 617.246).
- Minn. Stat. § 609.352 defines “child” for that section as age 15 or younger, while many other Minnesota child-protection statutes use an under-18 definition, creating inconsistency that can confuse the public and complicate enforcement decisions.
- Predators target older teens (ages 16–17) through manipulation, coercion, and authority abuse, particularly in online contexts and in settings where adults have supervision over youth.
- Clear, consistent definitions and graduated penalties improve enforceability and strengthen deterrence while preserving due process through intent and pattern requirements.

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT**

- Our caucus supports aligning Minnesota statutory definitions so that child-sex-exploitation laws consistently protect minors under 18, while allowing graduated penalties based on age (e.g., under 13, under 16, and under 18).
- We support amending \*\*Minn. Stat. § 609.352\*\* to evaluate whether its definition of “child” should be updated or supplemented, and to ensure coverage for electronic communication schemes that target minors ages 16–17, consistent with constitutional safeguards.
- We support directing legislative counsel to draft conforming amendments to maintain clarity across Chapters 609 and 617, including cross-references to existing definitions of “sexual conduct” and related terms where appropriate.

**[to Protect Children from Sexual Grooming ]**

**RESOLUTION NO. 3C (2026)**

**TITLE: Modernize and Align Minnesota’s Child-Protection Definitions and Coverage**

**WHEREAS,**

- Cases involving child grooming and solicitation can involve repeated conduct, multiple victims, and significant long-term harm, yet outcomes can sometimes result in charge reductions that remove meaningful accountability or registration requirements.
- The Andrew’s Law federal outline proposes prohibiting plea bargains or charge reductions for grooming offenses, reflecting a public concern that serious child-sex-predation crimes should not be minimized through routine negotiations.
- Minnesota must balance accountability with constitutional separation of powers and prosecutorial discretion; however, the Legislature can set guardrails to ensure transparency, victim consultation, and that plea outcomes do not erase public-safety safeguards.
- Minnesota’s predatory offender registration statute (Minn. Stat. § 243.166) demonstrates that registration is a core public-safety tool tied to specific offenses.

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT**

- Our caucus supports statutory reforms requiring that any plea agreement in a child-grooming/solicitation case include: (1) documented victim (or parent/guardian) notification and opportunity to be heard; and (2) written judicial findings on the record that the agreement protects public safety and is supported by evidence.
- We support establishing a “registration floor” so plea negotiations may not be used to circumvent predatory-offender registration when the underlying facts establish grooming/solicitation of a minor, except upon specific findings stated on the record.
- We support increasing penalties for grooming/solicitation committed by offenders who hold a position of trust or authority over the minor (teacher/coach/clergy/counselor/medical professional), and requiring treatment and supervised release conditions tailored to risk.
- We support adding the new grooming offense (§ 609.352A) and any aggravated variants to the list of registerable offenses in **\*\*Minn. Stat. § 243.166\*\*** and ensuring sentencing tools are available for courts to impose supervision conditions appropriate to the risk.