



MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA

Protecting consumers by advancing high quality, safe medical care.

2005 Evergreen Street
Sacramento, CA 95815-5401
Phone: (916) 263-2382
www.mbc.ca.gov

Gavin Newsom, Governor, State of California | Business, Consumer Services and Housing Agency | Department of Consumer Affairs

Tuesday, May 28, 2019

MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, May 28, 2019

Due to timing for invited guests to provide their presentations, the agenda items below are listed in the order they were presented.

Members Present:

Denise Pines, President (Santa Monica location)
Michelle Anne Bholat, M.D., Secretary (Santa Monica location)
Susan F. Friedman (Santa Monica location)
Dev GnanaDev, M.D. (Colton location)
Randy W. Hawkins, M.D. (Inglewood location)
Kristina D. Lawson, J.D. (Walnut Creek location)
Laurie Rose Lubiano, J.D. (Walnut Creek location)
David Warmoth (San Diego location)
Felix C. Yip, M.D. (Los Angeles location)

Members Absent:

Howard R. Krauss, M.D.
Ronald H. Lewis, M.D., Vice President
Brenda Sutton-Wills
Jamie Wright, J.D.

Staff Present:

Sean Eichelkraut, Information Technology Supervisor II
Kimberly Kirchmeyer, Executive Director
Christine Lally, Deputy Director
Nicole Kraemer, Staff Services Manager I
Regina Rao, Associate Governmental Program Analyst
Elizabeth Rojas, Staff Services Analyst
Jennifer Simoes, Chief of Legislation
Kevin Valone, Staff Services Analyst
Carlos Villatoro, Public Information Manager
Kerrie Webb, Staff Counsel

Members of the Audience:

Kate Abbott
Laura Adams
Sara Agrifili
Tricia Ainsworth
Darlene Akquiza
Jorge Alarcon
Fadi Alderre
Matt Allen
Kari Allen Hammer
Megan Allred, California Medical Association
Erika Altes
Regina Alvarez
Emily Anderson
Melissa Anderson
Rachel Andreis
Eric Andrist
Casey Angulo
Nicole Apodaca
Trent Archer
Veronica Archer
Ashley Armstrong
Jenna Asbury
Christina Atkinson
Lisa Atnaum
Lisa Augustin
Kelli Auld
Tiffany Baer, M.D.
Jeanette Bailey
Heather Baker
Carly Baldi
Catherine Baldi
Leah Balecha, R.N.
Mark Banasiak
Andrea Barnhart, M.D.
Jessica Banta
Beth Barnum
Alicia Barrie
Anna Barry-Jester, Kaiser Health News
Vivian Barton
Noemi Bass
Cindy Bauman
Ricardo Beas
Stacie Becker
Jessica Benavides

Medical Board of California
Meeting Minutes from May 28, 2019
Page 3

Summer Berry
Stephanie Berolona
Jessica Bibb
Serra Blaine
Karen Blechman
Mia Blomquist
Kelli Boehm, California Medical Association
Summer Boger
Amy Bohn
Jessica Bojorquez
Jacquelyn Bone
Kelly Bouey
Lee Bourne
Kimberly Boyd
Gina Briganti, United for Parents
Abigail Brown
Katherine Brown
Sylvia Bruner
Natalie Bruwer
Tawny Buettner
Elise Burk
Shannon Burwell
Ariana Bushati
Molly Butler
Mary Cain-Simon, Supervising Deputy Attorney General, Health Quality Enforcement Section,
Attorney General's Office
Cristen Callender
Brittany Cammarata
Shawna Campbell
Ruth Campo
Chisfon Campoli
Jessica Cannatello
Tina Cardenas
Vicki Carney
Elana Carr
Amanda Carrion
Rita Carter
Melanie Cartmell
Morgan Carvajal, California Medical Association
Amy Castellanos
Morgan Caster
Kristen Castro
Kimberly Caton
Myrna Chahdeh
Gayle Chang

Medical Board of California
Meeting Minutes from May 28, 2019
Page 4

Stefanie Chapa
Barbara Centeno
Joshua W. Centeno
Belen Cervantes
Yvonne Choong, California Medical Association
Katherine Ciccarelli
Gabriele Clinging Smith
Erin Charlens
Amy Coburn
Mary Collin
Camille Collings, Teacher
Nicole Collins
Tanya Collins
Crystal Contreras
Leslie Cope
Jennifer Corcoran
Laura Cordell
Erika Cota
Vanessa Cox
Richille Cute
Frank Cyr
Jennifer Danczyk
Karrie Danfors
Madeline Day
Dena DeLatorre
Esmeralda Delgado
Jessica Deloa
Carmen del Castillo
Michael del Castillo
Terry Di Martini
Toni DeMatteis
Alyssa DeMint
Jenna Derrick
Isabella Diefenbach
Monica Dody
Rebecca Dowell
Margaret Dooner
Nicole Dorfman
Heather Dosremedios
Maral Doucakin
Sadie Dousrana
Diana Douglas, Policy Analyst, Office of Senator Pan
Nicole Dow
Andrea Dublin
Many Durkin

Medical Board of California
Meeting Minutes from May 28, 2019
Page 5

Julie E
Windi Eklund
Krista Elliot
Lindsey Ellis
Joy Erb
Desiree Escaona
Veronica Escobar
Erica Escobedo
Rebecca Estepp
Jami Faucett
Emily Faulknor
Shelia Fay
Brent Fellows
Angela Ferguson
Ashley Fernandez
Diana Fierro
Mary Figge
Fernanda Firman
Meredith Fitzgerald
Kristal Flores
Stacey Flores
Susan Forbes
Michelle Ford, Vaccine Awareness League
Cindy Fowler
Jessica Fruitman
Angela Funk, R.N.
Christin Galarraga
Keriah Garcia
Joelle Gaspard
Nina Gibbs
Victoria Gintu
Heidi Gleisener
Elise Godown
Catherine Goneld
Kelsy Good
Attelio Gomez
Magdalena Gomez
Pelle Gomez
Pia Gomez
Jennifer Gonzales
Kathy Gonzales
Serenity Gordon
Inger Grape
Vivian Gray
Amy Graziano

Medical Board of California
Meeting Minutes from May 28, 2019
Page 6

Mary Grece
Oksama Grinevich
Andrew Griffiths
Melissa Griffiths
Angela Gufman
Viviana Gutierrez
Hillary Ha
Yunona Hagopoganian
Catherine Hall
Stephanie Hamid
Eric Hamler
Danielle Hampton
Brian Harbin
Lilia Harris
Sara Harrison
Alma Hart
Michael Hart
Sean Hart
Jamie Hartel
Sara Hartman
Ashley Hasemeyer
Hannah Hathcock
Jill Hawk
Tara Hayes
Stephanie Hegemier
Kassondra Henry
Janelle Hensley
Sabrina Hernandez
Jessica Herod
Tina Herter
Yasmine Hickman
Christina Hildebrand, Voice for Choice Advocacy
Karrie Hill
Courtney Hochman
Nicole Hofmaster
Marian Hollingsworth, Patient Safety Action Network
Jennifer Hontucan
Jessia Hopman
Brittney Horn
Emma Horne
Jackie Horton
Rachel Howes
Kristen Hundley
Abigail Imburgia
Alejandra Iniquez

Medical Board of California
Meeting Minutes from May 28, 2019
Page 7

Shauna Irwin
Tiffani Iselin
Shannon Jacattea
Stephanie Jackson
Lori James
Troy Jaques
Linda Jauregui
Nick Johansen
Bradley Johnson
Cassie Johnson
Catherine Johnson
Joy Johnson
Judea Johnson
Kerri Johnson
Angela Jones
Olema Kamyuka
Brittney Kara, Hope Inc., Academy
Cathy Kayne
Gemma Keldrauk
Sarah Kelly
Stacia Kenet, M.D.
Victoria Kennicutt
Michal Keswick
Elaine Kim
Shannon Kinet
Jim King
Jessica Kirkendall
Michaela Kissinger
Mya Klat
Jennifer Klemm
Claudia Koerner, Buzz Feed News
Svetlana Kovalev
Kathy Kraitz
Concetta Kramer
Hillary Kusko
Courtney Lackey, SCV4 Parental Rights
Arta Lahiji
Steve Lamb
Suzette Lamons
Kristine Landers
Kacie Lanphier
Sierra Largent
Lidia Ledneva
Joanna Lee
Lionel H. Lee, D.O.

Medical Board of California
Meeting Minutes from May 28, 2019
Page 8

Hilary Lefever
Monica Lemos, R.N.
Monica Leson
Hava Levi
Miriam Levin
Jackie Lewis
Krishnabai Lewis
Sandi Linden
Christina Lopez
Minna Lopez
Rheannon Lopez
Sarah Lopez
Suzette Loy
Karena Luna
Traci Lupo
Alicia M
Douglas Mackenzie, M.D.
Celina Madrigal
Heather Magness
Thomas Maier
Amber Malfavon
Jessica Mansour
Gina Marsh
David Marshall
Erin Massengale
Barbara Martello, M.D.
Sarah Martin
Melissa Martinez
Emily Matoza
Lisa Matsubara, California Medical Association
Aileen Mauro
Alexandra Mayer, Children's Health Defense
Lindsie McBratney
Katherine McBride
Danica McCluer
Andrea McDaniel
Sarah McGill
Ambra McInerny
Brittney McLaughlin
James McNeill
Beatriz Medrano
Lisa Megyesi
Cheryl Mercer
Celena Mesa
Andrea Michael

Stephanie Milazzo
Matt Miller
Nicole Miller
Shira Miller, M.D., Physicians for Informed Consent
Brittney Mineer
Jim Ming
Julie Ming
Michelle Miskovich
Kristen Mitchell
Courtney Mock
Ines Moellor, PhD
Kristen Molchan
Chanel Morales
Kara Morales
DeeDee Moreda
Linda Moreno
Michelle Morly
Mahid Moussighi
Laci Muirhead
Diane Murphy
Samantha Murphy
Jessica Muryria
Lisa Musculman
Kay P. Myers
Sara Nagai
Joy Nakaatari
Deborah Newman
Jordan Newberry
Sarah Newberry
Tina Ngo
Maya Nicholls, Children's Health Defense
Melissa Nicolai
Brandi Nolan
Jennifer Nomi
Sandra Nunez
Greg O'Donnell
Tami Ogle
Regina Ohigashi
Julie Olson
Sandi Olson
Galina Omdar
Michelle O'Neill
Yvette Ordaz
Jessica Ornelas
Mercedes Orozo

Laura Otto
Courtney Painter, Progressives for Choice
David Palomino
Jazmin Palomino
Sofia Pavlova
Heather Pecora
Samantha Pellon, California Medical Association
Jennifer Pendergrasp
Amy Peralta
Elizabeth Perez
Gretel Perez
Kimberly Perry
Ashlee Petrilli
Shireen Pigott
Christy Piluso
Lauren Pinto
Kelli Pitman
Elizabeth Porter
Deb Poulson
Gaea Powell
Lori Prescott, Advocate for Physicians Right
Jessica Presley
Shannon Primer, Educate Advocate
Catherine Provental, M.D.
Kristine Prow
Gina Quevedo
Veronica Quintanar
Suzanne Reese
Ashlee Reeves
Devyn Reggio
Sandra Renfro Wilson
Sue Ell Rennie
Tami Resendez
Sarah Resnick
Heidi Rhys
Angie Rice
Judy Rich
Kendra Riches
Diana Rios
Terry Roark
Katherine Robi
Joanna Robosa
Justine Rodriguez, Arrowhead Regional Medical Center
Elizabeth Rogers
Megan Rogne

Stee Rose
Lisa Rosier
Corinne Ross
Lauren Roupoli
Christina Roush
Jessica Rubenstein, California Medical Association
Sarah Rule
Amy Rupprecht
Peter Rupprecht
Dianne Ruse
Leah Russin, Vaccinate California
Michelle Sabino
Adriana Saldana
Lee Salkowitz, Orange County Health Choice
Lauren Sanchez
Jeff Sanders
Stacey Stanley, Orange County Health Choice
Sally Sauvignon
Mark Scarlet, Supervising Investigator I, Health Quality Investigation Unit, Department of
Consumer Affairs
Debra Schaefer, Board of Advocates for Physicians Rights
Sasha Schaffer
Cara Schmidt
Giselle Scholz
Andre Schuurmans
Jessica Schuurmans
Lori Schwartz
Bridgett Seda
Melia Sefiane Coady
Kevin Selby
Shannon Sellers
Anurupa Sen
Taylor Senger
Kristie Sepulveda-Burchit, Educate Advocate
Allison Serrao
Sasha Shaffer
Nina Shah
Erin Sharbrough
Jennifer Shaw
Nancy Shaw, R.N.
Laura Shepard
Christina Sherman
Edward Sherman
Susana Shiel
David Shirazi

Jenna Shirley
Wendy Silvers
Jaime Siraton
Victoria Sirova
Kari Six
Breanna Skidmore
Erdona Skidmore
Yvonne Slater-Grigas
Joana Smith
Gwen Snodgrass
Erisa Softley
Alicia Soliz
Elisa Song
Ashlee Sourapas
Maria Sperber, California Hospital Association
Aileen Stadola
James Staylor
Jenna Staylor
Audra Straus
Jennifer Strayer
Allyson Steiner-Dowing
Jennifer Stevenson
Andrea Stewart
Ben Stubbs
Julia Sullivan
Penelope Sullivan
Shannon Summers
Elisa Surmont
Daniel Sutton
Kelly Sutton
Tanya Sutton
Brian Swanson
Rachelle Swodeck
Stacey Swartz
Deejay Sweet
Wendy Sylvester
Abdul Taalid-Din
Chelsea Tahan
Katherine Tarasyuk
Amy Taylor
Amanda Teneyck
Shannon Thompson, Educate Advocate
Maria Thorpe
Jenny Todesto
Kim Tomashewski

Jenny Trinh
Celina Trevino
Danitia Trylovich
Charmaine Turner
Bernie Unez
Pearl Utley
John Valencia, Wikle Fleury LLP
Leslie Valenzuela, Oceanside Homeschooling
Michael Vanderschelden
Jessica VanHille
Arsinee Varcanian
Delfino Vega
Elvira Vega
Krista Venti
Wendee Villanueva
Kymberly Vollmers
Jennifer W
Victoria Wagner
Sarah Waldron
Nicole Wallace
Jamila Ward
Catherine Warren
Andrea Watkins
Heather Watling
Vanessa Wenstrom
Andrea Whalen
Brian Whalen
Dr. Whang
Kayla Wildman
Gini Williams
Jill Williams
Lauren Williams
Rachel Williams
Tanya Wills
Alex Wilson
Shannon Winzenread
Jamie White
Ian Wilkerson, Children's Health Defense
Judith Wlekinski
Chris Wolcott
Griselda Wong
Mildred Wong
Kyla Worthen-Hall
Teddy Wu
Amanda Yamamoto

Jean Ybarra
Ronna Yelin
Denise Young
Caroline Yunker
Elizabeth Zamora
Kristen Zander
Tara Zandvliet
Beth Zapf
Debra Zehr
Morgan Zietlow
Lana Zimprich
Severn Zivalich
Lauren Zummo

Agenda Item 1 Call to Order/Roll Call/Establishment of a Quorum

Ms. Pines called the meeting of the Medical Board of California (Board) to order on May 28, 2019 at 4:10 p.m. A quorum was present and due notice was provided to all interested parties.

Agenda Item 2 Public Comments on Items not on the Agenda

Dr. Lahiji reminded the Board of its role to protect California patients from aging practitioners. She added that there should be an age guideline for the Board to compel physicians to undergo mandatory health, cognitive, hearing, and vision tests over age 65. She explained that she submitted a complaint to the Board regarding a 78 year old physician, requesting an examination and shared that there was no action by the Board. She inquired what the Board is doing to protect patients from aging physicians.

Ms. Powell commented that she would like to know how the Board will respond to the new documentary that creates a call to action by radiologists, oncologists, surgeons, obstetricians, naturopathic doctors, and scientists to protect a woman's right to unfettered access to their breast health imaging options and non-invasive breast cancer screenings. She added that mammograms can cause and spread cancer, and it has not reduced the mortality rate by even 1%. Based off of this, she opined that she would like to know what the Board will do to protect a woman's right to full disclosure of all the risks. She concluded that this would allow a woman to make informed decisions about her own body.

Ms. Roupoli shared that at 22 she had a mammogram and a biopsy and was not given the negative side effects. She echoed that everyone should be aware of the negative side effects.

Ms. Burchit requested a future agenda item to investigate doctors who turn patients away due to their vaccine status.

Agenda Item 3 Discussion and Possible Action on the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' Regulation titled "Protecting Statutory Conscience Rights in Health Care; Delegations of Authority," Issued on May 2, 2019

Ms. Webb announced that on May 21, 2019, the federal government published a rule titled "Protecting Statutory Conscious Rights in Health Care; Delegations of Authority" and explained that the rule is set to become effective on July 22, 2019. She stated this rule significantly broadens existing federal conscience protections. She confirmed that this rule is in conflict with several federal and California state laws, as well as the Board's mission. She detailed that the consequences of this bill are expected to disproportionately impact access to care for women, religious minorities, sexual assault victims, people living with HIV and AIDS, and the LGBTQ community. She concluded by sharing that Board staff recommends the Board take an oppose position on this rule and delegate authority to President Pines to assist the Attorney General's Office (AGO) in opposing it.

Ms. Fontes Rainer, Special Assistant Attorney General from the AGO, updated the Board, informing them that her office filed a complaint against the rule itself on behalf the State of California. The complaint was filed since it conflicts with underlying regulations across state agencies and state law. She explained that the rule is a broad overage of current federal conscience protection laws and regulations, creating a broad exemption for anyone in the healthcare industry to deny an individual health care with no emergency exemptions. She highlighted that this will interfere with the practice of medicine and patients getting access to care. She concluded by asking the Board for support in opposing this rule and cited the list of agencies that are also in opposition.

Dr. GnanaDev made a motion to oppose the regulation titled "Protecting Statutory Conscious Rights in Health Care; Delegations of Authority" and to delegate the Board President to work with the Attorney General's Office to work on this issue; s/ Mr. Warmoth.

Ms. Lubiano noted that this rule will go into effect in July and inquired how opposition would work to prevent it from going into effect.

Ms. Fontes Rainer responded that the complaint that was filed detailed how the rule conflicts both federal and constitutional law. Another avenue that can be taken is to try to stop the rule itself through an injunction. She confirmed that if the Board were to support the opposition effort, the effort would be in support of whatever the next step would be in order to stop it before the effective date.

Ms. Hildebrand, Voice for Choice Advocacy, echoed the comment of Ms. Burchit. She pointed out that that Board is creating such a large impact due to this ruling, however, there are doctors in California that refuse care for children due to their medical status. She noted that although cases have been reported to the Board, nothing has been done about it.

Mr. Andrist expressed his agreement with opposing this rule. He inquired what the Board has in place now to handle these situations. He asked if the Board is already proposing ways to handle cases when this type of complaint is received.

Motion carried unanimously (9-0).

Agenda Item 4 Discussion and Possible Action on SB 276 (Pan) Immunizations: Medical Exemptions

Ms. Simoes provided background on Senate Bill (SB) 277, which passed in 2015, eliminating the personal belief exemption from the requirement that children receive specific vaccinations for certain infectious diseases prior to being admitted to any school or daycare center. She explained that after the passage of SB 277, the Board has had a difficult time investigating complaints related to medical exemptions since an authorization of medical records needs to be signed and many parents or guardians do not want to sign the authorization since it would identify the doctor that provided the medical exemption. She explained that this causes a barrier to investigation since most medical exemption cases cannot be subpoenaed and medical records are needed to conduct an investigation.

Ms. Simoes explained that SB 276, Pan, requires the California Department of Public Health (CDPH) to develop a statewide standardized medical exemption request form, made available for physicians in California by July 1, 2020. She detailed that beginning January 1, 2021, this form shall be the only medical exemption documentation that a governing authority may accept. Additionally, a medical exemption request form must be approved or denied only by the state public health officer or their designee and the form would include an authorization for the release of medical records. She concluded by noting that this bill furthers the mission of the Board and specified that Board staff recommends that the Board take a support position.

Ms. Simoes detailed that the Board received numerous public comments on this agenda item and reminded the Board Members that they have been given the comments. She noted that some comments came in the day of the meeting and those comments will be disseminated to Members the following day.

Ms. Kirchmeyer added that there were 76 calls that were received in opposition.

Ms. Friedman made a motion to support SB 276; s/ Dr. Hawkins.

Dr. Hawkins asked for any statistics relating to the impact of vaccinations.

Ms. Simoes noted that there are some statistics in the analysis. She pointed out that vaccinations have gone up, but so too have medical exemptions.

Dr. Yip asked about content of the information received from the public.

Ms. Simoes responded that they are overwhelmingly in opposition.

Ms. Lubiano pointed out that a concern for patients is that they fall outside of the exemption and inquired what can be done to appeal the process.

Ms. Simoes explained the denial may be appealed to the state public health officer and the physician can submit additional information to CDPH within 30 days of the notification.

A member of the public reminded the Board that Senator Pan stated that SB 277 will leave a wide discretion to doctors to exercise their professional judgment. She noted that if a doctor is not allowed to use their professional judgment to honor the Hippocratic Oath due to fear of retaliation from the Board, the public will not have a medical system that can be trusted.

A member of the public shared that the Board has investigated 153 cases of medical exemptions and found no cases of fraud. She added that this bill addresses a problem that does not exist. She concluded by noting that SB 276 is not in line with the mission of the Board and implored the Board to oppose the bill.

Mr. King, a concerned parent, expressed his concern that the Board has already made a decision and inquired what the point is of the public sending emails and making comments if it will not be taken into consideration.

A medical defense attorney representing her clients questioned if the Board would rather families and doctors feel unobstructed in writing valid medical exemptions or have people falsify their medical records be able to allow their children an education. She commented that she would rather live in the truth of the situation rather than the illusion of safety.

A member of the public pointed out that if a child gets a vaccination and has a reaction to the vaccination that would currently qualify for a medical exemption. She pointed out that right now as the bill is stated, the child would not qualify.

A concerned parent vocalized that in the United States of America a person should have the freedom to decide what is injected into their body. She continued that it is the right of the parent to make that decision for their child. She added that it is not communist Russia.

A member of the public shared that her condition would not be recognized as an exemption and vocalized her concern that her future grandchildren will be harmed by this bill. She shared that she has spent her life fighting against this and expressed her fear that her work would not be recognized.

Ms. Kinet, a concerned parent, opined that her understanding of this bill is that she cannot trust her doctor. She detailed the difficulty she has had trying to find a doctor that will listen to the reactions that her child has had to a vaccine.

A member of the public detailed that her daughter has seizures and asked the Board to trust her doctor and their opinion.

A member of the public expressed their opposition to require patients to submit to government ordered medical treatment without informed consent even when a physician certified that a medical exemption is warranted. She reminded the Board that the Hippocratic Oath is taken so that physicians do not harm patients and that the judgment of a government agency should not be imposed upon physicians.

Ms. Galarraga, a concerned parent, pointed out that this is an unnecessary bill requiring \$10 million a year for .07% of the state's children. She questioned what the cost will be for the appeals process and inquired how this will be handled.

A member of the public shared that Senator Pan stated that if a physician feels there is a genetic association in a family, making them unfit for vaccine, the physician can provide a medical exemption for the vaccine. She opined that with SB 276 the doctor-patient relationship will be severed. She concluded that state officials do not have the same lifelong relationship as consumers have with their physician and pointed out that it is alarming that a state official would decide what is in the best interest of an individual.

A member of the public vocalized her fear that this bill would demonize medically fragile children like her own. She added that the bill violates the secret doctor-patient relationship and that it is an overreach of the government on the public's medical freedoms. She concluded that an individual should have the autonomy over their body and that coercion is not consent.

Dr. Lee commented that this bill takes away the doctor's right to be a physician and pointed out that there is a strong legal challenge for privacy. He added that if the LGBTQ community can be protected, so too should children. He concluded by noting that medicine is not one size fits all.

Ms. Schuurmans, a concerned parent, commented that she will not comply no matter what the law is. She added that the doctor-patient relationship needs to remain as is and opined that this bill is a violation on many levels. She stated that a vaccine almost killed her and it injured her first born.

Ms. Hernandez expressed her opposition of the bill and explained the difficult process she endured to get her children medical exemptions.

Mr. Centeno listed the ways in which this bill is intrusive, noting that it will deteriorate the public's confidence in the doctor-patient relationship, their confidence in each individual relationship with their doctor, and violates privacy.

Mr. Staylor expressed his opposition of SB 276 and recommended that the Board do the same since it violates the doctor-patient relationship and does not cover all of the contraindications.

A member of the public commented that if an appointed health official is the one approving medical exemptions instead of a doctor, there will be lawsuits when children are injured. She

added that \$4 billion dollars have been paid out to parents and families of vaccine injured children.

A member of the public stated that an individual has the right to make decisions about their own body and that of their children.

A member of the public opined that SB 276 is bothersome and shared that the doctor-patient relationship needs to be maintained. She added that she would not comply with this new law.

Ms. Staylor, a concerned parent, vocalized her opposition and echoed that there is no point for public comment if the Board will not listen to the public.

A member of the public shared her opposition of SB 276 and stated that medical exemptions need to be kept within the doctor-patient relationship. She added that the government does not personally know her children and the government would not be reviewing records, rather it would be an application that would go into a database.

Ms. Butler, a concerned parent, explained that her children will lose their medical exemption based upon the way that the law is currently written. She added that the list is not inclusive and contradicts SB 277. She noted that the bill is very expensive and speaks to a very low number of infants contracting measles in California.

A member of the public expressed her concern over narrowing of scope of potential risks that the exemptions would cover. She added that this could be dangerous for a lot of children.

A member of the public mentioned she has a Master's in Public Health and a strong background in biochemistry and explained that she helps heal vaccine injured kids. She urged the Board to oppose SB 276 and commented that this bill only accounts for .07% of the population. She added that the parent knows their child best and a doctor is a close second. She concluded by noting that the Center for Disease Control (CDC) asked the public to stop breastfeeding to make vaccines more efficient, which is a problem.

Ms. Horne explained that after SB 277, 10,000 children were vaccinated. She shared that the remaining families were only those who medically needed an exemption to keep them safe. She concluded by noting her opposition.

A member of the public commented that the cost of SB 276 is too high for California.

Ms. Schwartz urged the Board to oppose the bill since it is fiscally irresponsible and highlighted that there is already a system in place within the Board to deal with this issue.

Ms. Berolona, mother of three children, explained her own difficulty obtaining medical exemptions for her children. She asked the Board to oppose SB 276 since it is very expensive and Board investigations into this matter have found no fraud.

Ms. Balicha, a pediatric intensive care nurse, noted that of 45 measles cases in California, 35 of them were adults, and asked why adults are not being policed. She added that adults are spreading measles because of vaccine failure. She concluded by sharing that the goal is to do no harm, not consider exemptions after the harm has already been done.

Dr. Whang, a pediatrician in private practice, explained that in any field of medicine, prior family history of reactions counts as a medical exemption and should count for vaccines. She added that she opposes SB 276.

Ms. Bauman, a vaccine injured parent, predicted that there will be lawsuits of gross negligence as a result of this bill. She believes that this bill can erode trust with doctors and keep people from seeing a doctor. She stated that she opposes SB 276.

A member of the public vocalized their opposition of SB 276, pointing out that the state should not legislate doctors or medicine.

Ms. Douglas, Policy Analyst in the office of Dr. Pan, urged the Board to endorse the bill so that the Board can investigate physicians who endanger public health by engaging in unprofessional conduct. She added that the Board has faced multiple obstacles related to physicians granting inappropriate exemptions, as noted in the Board staff analysis.

Ms. Boehm, California Medical Association (CMA), announced CMA's support of SB 276. She remarked that concerns have been raised about physicians that are not upholding the patient standard of care and therefore putting the public at risk. She added that this undermines the integrity of other physicians who grant medically necessary exemptions for the 1% of patients who truly need them.

Ms. Palomino commented that she was there on behalf of many parents of the Central Valley to clarify that no cases of fraud have been found nor have the number of medical exemptions substantially increased.

A member of the public explained that she is a mother of two vaccine injured children and pointed out that the reason why the public seeks the doctors that the Board is investigating is due to the fact that they believe them. She shared that she would have to file a petition for every vaccine and expressed her exhaustion.

Ms. Wagner, the sister of a severely vaccine injured brother, explained that under the guidelines in the bill her brother would not qualify. She detailed that her daughter is susceptible to vaccine injury based on family history, however, under the new guidelines this will no longer be true. She added that she will have to home-school her child which will cause extreme hardship for her family.

Ms. Del Castillo remarked that she represents 600 residents in Placer County and Sacramento region and shared her story of her vaccine injured children. She asked the Board to oppose SB 276.

A member of the public commented that SB 276 will not preserve honesty and integrity in the doctor-patient relationship. He vocalized that it is unacceptable that the bill only grants exemptions based on the CDC contraindications. He added that the appeal process will be quiet costly and will take much of the doctor's time. He inquired how the public will be protected in that process.

A member of the public shared his opposition of SB 276 and noted that Senator Pan's comments are misguided and misrepresented. He recommended that the Board Members conduct their own research into this matter.

Ms. Collings, a teacher, pointed out that if SB 276 were to pass, it would set a dangerous precedent of the state being able to override the medical decisions of physicians. She remarked that if there are immoral doctors selling medical exemptions as asserted by Senator Pan, the Board should take action that does not penalize all the doctors in the state.

Ms. Nichols, a concerned parent, pointed out that Senator Allen, the primary co-author with Senator Pan on SB 277 does not support SB 276 since he stands behind the promises made during SB 277. Specifically, the exemptions are no longer broad and the physician is not able to write the exemption at their own discretion.

A member of the public, a registered nurse, expressed her opposition of SB 276. She asked the Board to reflect on the Hippocratic Oath and if SB 276 respects the autonomy of the individual patient.

Ms. Harrison, a credentialed teacher, expressed her concern that the medical exemptions that she has for her children will be taken away. She added that she would not like her children to go into a database. She explained that Assembly Bill 276 will track unvaccinated children and confirmed that every parent should be concerned.

Ms. Kovalev expressed her opposition of SB 276 since it alters the relationship between the patient and the doctor and state licensing boards should not legislate the practice of medicine.

A member of the public with vaccine injured family members shared her opposition of the bill. She pointed out that the rights of the parents and the doctor-patient relationship are being violated.

A member of the public shared her story of her adoptive children and their birth with addiction to heroine and expressed her concern over injecting them with anything. She stated her opposition.

A member of the public explained that she followed the law under SB 277, obtained a medical exemption, and now under SB 276 that could be repealed. She concluded with her opposition of SB 276.

A member of the public, a pediatric occupational therapist that works with special needs children, expressed her opposition of SB 276 since it punishes children with legitimate medical concerns. She concluded that the bill will cost the state an exorbitant amount of money to police 0.7% of the children in California.

A member of the public, a nurse and a veteran, stated her opposition of SB 276 due to vaccine injuries and taking away from the doctor-patient relationship.

Ms. Horn, a concerned parent, shared her opposition of SB 276 and provided the stories of her medically fragile children.

A member of the public, a nurse in an acute care setting, provided all of the vaccine reactions not qualified under CDC guidelines and pointed out that vaccine reaction injuries can be very dangerous.

A member of the public shared that the real frauds are the Health and Human Services and the CDC. She urged the Board to do the right thing and oppose SB 276.

Ms. Newberry shared her opposition of SB 276 due to her children's medical history. She explained that she has gone through the legal process to be in compliance with the law and that is now being stripped away from her.

Ms. Quintanar shared the medical background of her children and asked the Board to oppose SB 276. She detailed that it takes away her right as a parent.

Ms. Cannatello explained that she will never risk that her daughter get vaccines and shared that she has gone through the proper channels to obtain an exemption.

Dr. Miller, the Founder and President of Physicians for Informed Consent, indicated that the number of measles cases and the number of medical exemptions are not a major indicator of the health of the population. However, infant mortality rate is a measure of public health and SB 276 like laws have not proven to improve public health. She stated her opposition of SB 276.

A member of the public added that legislators were in favor of the bill since they were told that doctors would be protected and family history would be considered, but this is not the case. She vocalized her opposition.

Ms. Good, a vaccine injured single parent, explained that she will not comply and her daughter will not qualify for an exemption. She concluded by stating her opposition to SB 276.

Ms. Charlens expressed her opposition of SB 276 since it does not punish fraudulent doctors and it will hurt children. She provided the story of her son, his medical history, and inability to get an exemption.

Ms. Buettner, pediatric registered nurse and mother, asked the Board to oppose SB 276. She explained how the bill would create a conflict of interest for the Board and noted that it does not support the mission of the Board.

Ms. Valenzuela, a homeschooling mother, provided details of her vaccine injured children and shared that she would not like to vaccinate her children.

Ms. Brown, a vaccine injured parent, provided details of her vaccine injured family and shared that they would not qualify for an exemption in this bill. She expressed her opposition of the bill.

Ms. Riches, a mother of a vaccine injured child, teacher, and early childhood specialist, explained that over 50% of children have chronic health disorders and doctors need to stand up for what is right for their health. She added that a database with sensitive medical information is not safe and is expensive. She vocalized her opposition.

Ms. Henry, a concerned parent, detailed the medical background of her child and explained that he would not qualify for a medical exemption. She added that she does not trust a product whose manufacturer is currently in litigation for falsifying data.

Dr. Barnhart, a doctor of Optometry and a concerned parent, clarified this bill is about medical exemptions, who can validate them, and what criteria can be used. She added that this is best in the hands of highly trained and trusted physicians.

Ms. Morales, educator and concerned parent, provided the medical history of her child and noted that she would not be provided an exemption under SB 276. She asked the Board if they would find this acceptable for their families. She concluded that it is not acceptable to harm hundreds of children to catch a few fraudulent exemptions.

A member of the public, the sister of Ms. Morales, expressed her concerns that her children could become vaccine injured and urged that family history stand as under SB 277.

A member of the public pointed out that SB 276 targets fraudulent medical exemptions, but noted that there are none on record, which questions the validity of the Board. She highlighted that it would affect her relationship with her physician and children.

A member of the public remarked that SB 276 is too expensive and suggested that the money be better spent on special education classes. She opposed SB 276.

Ms. White, a parent and school counselor, detailed that the bill does not take into account genetics, family history, or other serious adverse reactions. Additionally, she explained that other issues are that the patient will not be examined before or after a vaccination and will not have an ongoing relationship with the physician.

Ms. Johnson shared that she emailed the Board to inquire about the position of the Board on SB 276 and was told that the Board had not taken one, however, she was confused since it seems that there is support of the bill. She added that in taking that position, it sends a message that the Board does not believe doctors are capable of supplying adequate medical care. She concluded by noting her opposition.

Dr. Moellor, a vaccine injured parent, explained that over a thousand cases of serious vaccine injuries are reported every year and she noted that there may be more injuries. She pointed out this number is larger than the number of current measles cases. She vocalized her opposition of SB 276.

Ms. Gleisener expressed her concern of the analysis of the bill. She remarked that every physician she has seen asks for an extensive family medical history, so to claim that this would not be considered goes against the standard of care. She added that SB 277 was working and included family history.

Ms. Herter, a veterinarian and holder of a medical degree from Germany, detailed her experience witnessing vaccine reactions. She stated that the Board should protect doctors that write medical exemptions and practice within their oath. She provided her opposition.

Ms. Kissinger recommended that the money from SB 276 be spent on understanding where the measles are coming from. She concluded by noting her opposition.

Mr. Selby, a parent of a vaccine injured child, provided the details of his son's situation and noted that his exemption would not be covered under SB 276. He expressed his opposition of the climate of fear and misinformation that leads to doctors not discerning or being able to help the vaccine injured.

Ms. Villanueva pointed out that schools have a list of exemptions, so if an outbreak were to occur, the law permits an investigation and for the students to be quarantined. Since consumers are already protected, she urged the Board to abstain from taking a position on SB 276.

A member of the public commented that SB 277 allowed physicians to provide the exemptions and pointed out that they were not exploiting a loophole. She added that the Board needs to punish doctors that harm consumers, not harm medically fragile children.

Ms. Massengale inquired if the Board will take liability for maintaining her child's private medical information. She pointed out that Veterans Affairs compensated veterans \$20 million after a laptop with identifiable information was misplaced.

Ms. Benavides shared her personal history with vaccines as well as her child's. She noted concerns over privacy and freedoms. She asked the Board to oppose SB 276.

Mr. Beas commented that vaccines have not been proven safe. He stated that he opposes SB 276.

Ms. Mayer inquired if Members of the Board have global entry at the airport. She pointed out that there are exemptions to security that are perfectly legal.

Ms. Keswick, University of California, Berkeley Public Health graduate, asked where in the Constitution it states that a child must be vaccinated. She shared that 450,000 deaths are caused by cigarette smoke, which is illegal. She noted that the medical profession is already dying and people no longer want to be doctors.

Ms. Piluso, a California credential teacher and home-school teacher to her vaccine injured children, explained that her children's medical exemptions will be taken away. She expressed concern that it will destroy the doctor-patient relationship and someone who does not know her child will make decisions for them.

Ms. Baldi commented that SB 276 would inhibit the Board from investigating doctors and signing the release would violate HIPAA.

Ms. Bloomquist urged the Board to kill the bill. She recommended that the bill grandfather in current children with medical exemptions. She echoed that if there is an outbreak, the schools have records of unvaccinated children and they will be excluded from school.

Ms. Ford, President and Founder of the Vaccine Injury Awareness League, representing tens of thousands of families in California, commented that the bill is unnecessary since there is no evidence of wrongdoing by a California doctor. She added California only has 0.07% medical exemptions on record with an overall drop in personal belief exemptions. She also commented on the cost of the bill.

Mr. Shirazi echoed that the population in question is less than 1% of the population and pointed out that more focus needs to be put on Senator Pan, who has received at least \$100,000 in pharmaceutical donations to his campaign.

Ms. Carney, a parent, expressed her opposition of SB 276 since it is against the doctor-patient relationship and many doctors will not help families that are at risk of vaccine injury due to fear that they will lose their license. She urged that individual decisions on vaccines be kept with the doctor, not to the state.

Dr. Mackenzie urged the Board to oppose SB 276 due to the Board's mission to prompt access to quality medical care. He added that public health officials have no relationship with these fragile children, nor do they have any business determining care based on the CDC guidelines. He concluded that some families have no ability to home-school or move out of the state and these children will be put in harm's way.

Ms. Lupo provided details of her vaccine injured son and asked the Board to protect the doctor-patient relationship.

Ms. Dowell, a concerned parent, expressed her opposition of SB 276 since it does not allow for tighter testing, does not exclude a booster vaccine, and applies at birth. She added that every time there is a schedule delay, a parent will need to get a new exemption, which she opined is ridiculous.

Ms. Sourapas, a midwifery student, explained that this bill does not support a unique doctor-patient relationship or that each body is unique. She added that the medical model is not one-size-fits and that the bill infringes upon doing no harm as a practitioner and takes away the role and responsibility of a practitioner.

Ms. Briganti vocalized that the Board should have an issue with the bill since it denies that genetics is a factor in vaccine history, which the CDC has stated needs to be addressed. She asked the Board to oppose the bill since parents will lose their right to informed consent.

Ms. Bushati asked the Board to think about their intentions when becoming a doctor and asked the Board to vote their heart, integrity, and own families. She noted that this bill will destroy doctor-patient relationships.

Ms. Roupoli vocalized her opposition of SB 276 and the rule titled "Protecting Statutory Conscious Rights in Health Care; Delegations of Authority." She provided details of her child's vaccination history.

Ms. Burwell, an adoption consultant in Los Angeles, explained that this bill redefines a valid medical exception and destroys the subtleties and complexities of the doctor-patient relationship. She urged the Board not to support SB 276.

Ms. Leson, an oncology registered nurse and concerned parent, asked the Board to oppose SB 276. She explained how the bill will disproportionately affect low-income Californians and people of color.

Ms. Sullivan asked the Board to look into the waning immunity of vaccines.

Ms. Sellers, a concerned parent, expressed how SB 276 infringes upon the critical doctor-patient relationship and would force doctors to violate their Hippocratic Oath. She added that bureaucrats should not make medical decisions for children they will never meet. She added that the CDC's exemption guidelines are outdated.

Ms. Linden, a concerned parent, cautioned that this bill is a slippery slope and expressed her opposition.

A member of the public commented that they are a scientist that worked on vaccine development and is also a registered nurse. She explained her tie to vaccine injured children and shared that she feels she is losing her freedom. She expressed her opposition of SB 276.

Ms. Surmont vocalized her opposition of SB 276 since it affects such a small portion of the population, which are medically fragile children that need protection. She added that the CDC list of contraindications is extremely narrow.

Ms. Godown shared her opposition to SB 276 since it addresses a problem that does not exist, it infringes on patient and consumer privacy, and is not in line with the mission of the Board.

Ms. Herod, a concerned parent, explained that SB 276 goes against HIPAA, the mission of the Board, and is fiscally irresponsible. She reminded the Board of the public response to the bill and urged the Board to oppose the bill.

Ms. Ngo, a concerned parent, expressed her opposition to SB 276 and explained her family's history.

Ms. Williams, a mother of three, expressed her opposition of SB 276 since these decisions should be left in the hands of medical professionals and not the government.

Ms. Nicolai opined that SB 276 is attempting to solve a problem that does not exist. She added that doctors need to support their patients in the way that they see fit.

Mr. Bourne inquired how the bill could be supported with the high vaccine rate failure as seen with whooping cough.

Mr. Sanchez expressed her opposition of SB 276 since there have been no cases of fraud found by the Board. He added that it infringes upon the doctor-patient relationship.

A member of the public asked the Board to join the two authors of SB 277 to oppose SB 276. She provided the story of her son and how he would not qualify for a medical exemption under SB 276. She asked the Board to follow the money to Senator Pan.

Ms. Winzenread commented that if the bill does not protect the doctor-patient relationship, the motives should be questioned. She added that the pharmaceutical companies hold no accountability to vaccines, which could lead to an abuse of power.

Ms. Reeves, a parent of two, explained the medical history of her children and how she was unable to get an exemption since physicians are fearful of repercussions from medical facilities. She noted that the exemption obtained for her son would no longer be valid with SB 276.

Ms. Prow, an attorney, shared that she does not believe that obtaining access to medical records will be helped by this bill. She noted that California aims to protect patient's rights.

Ms. Serrao asked the Board if they are willing to be liable for the lives that are affected by SB 276.

Ms. Sabino explained her personal story related to vaccinations. She noted that if the Board votes in favor of this bill, it will relinquish power over 0.7% of medical exemptions and will marginalize people of color, people with lower socioeconomic status, and people with a lower immune system.

Mr. Andrist pointed out that not vaccinating puts others in danger and proliferates disease. He vocalized his support of the bill, but noted his opposition to the portion of the bill that puts CDPH in charge. He added that CDPH will be flooded with applications for exclusion, which will give less attention to the important cases.

Ms. Wallace, a chiropractor, stated her opposition of the bill since physicians cannot make an informed decision with their patients and family history will not be taken into consideration.

Ms. Collin commented that it is her decision with her doctor to vaccinate her children, not the state. She inquired how the Board lives with themselves if there are more vaccine injured children after the passing of SB 276.

Ms. Mercer vocalized her opposition of SB 276 since the government would come between her, her child, and her doctor. She urged the Board to oppose SB 276.

Ms. Worthen-Hall, a concerned mother, urged the Board to oppose SB 276 to protect medically fragile children, protect and honor their privacy and right to an education, and their relationships with their doctors.

Ms. Summers, a concerned parent, pointed out that SB 276 eliminates the privacy of doctor-patient relationships, takes away the right to medical exemptions, and is government overreach.

Ms. Kirkendall, a medical research professional and concerned parent, vocalized her opposition due to the exemptions covered in the bill and since a government official should not be making medical decisions.

Dr. Provental commented that SB 276 is an imposition on the doctor-patient relationship and an infringement on patient confidentiality. She expressed her opposition of SB 276.

Ms. Levin, a concerned parent, expressed her opposition of SB 276. She asked what investigations were being conducted on Senator Pan.

Ms. Sepulveza-Burchet asked the Board to take a neutral position on SB 276.

A member of the public pointed out the amount of money that has been paid out in settlements to families to cover losses since the manufacturer is not responsible.

Ms. Gordon explained the situation of her family and commented on the burden that this has caused financially and on the relationship with her doctor. She added that she will not comply with this bill and she opposes it.

Ms. Ciccarelli urged the Board to oppose SB 276, to protect patients and if passed, she noted that it would disproportionately and negatively impact the patient.

Ms. Lackey, SCV4 Parental Rights, implored the Board to oppose SB 276 since there have been no fraudulent medical exemptions found. She added that it infringes upon the sanctity of the doctor-patient relationship and consumer privacy.

Ms. Zivalich stated her opposition for SB 276.

Ms. James commented that SB 276 is a violation of the confidential doctor-patient relationship. She opined that the state of California has no right to interfere with this relationship.

Ms. Primer shared that she represents families across Southern California and military families across the country. She commented that the CDC acknowledges that it does not determine medical exemptions, the doctor does, and government officials should not be put in this role.

Ms. Campbell added that California has increased vaccine rates, has a high vaccine compliance rate, and medical exemptions are very low. She expressed that she would like doctors, not public health officials, balancing the risks and benefits for each individual family.

Ms. Tahan, a concerned parent, expressed her opposition of SB 276 and noted that if the bill passes, 95% of the current medical exemptions will be nullified. She asked the Board to hear the concerns of the public.

Ms. Bohn asked the Board if they have vaccine injured children. She specified that the impact of this bill would leave certain children unprotected by the state and would give more authority to an unlicensed government health official.

Mr. Allen urged the Board to oppose SB 276 to protect his privacy rights. He provided a personal story and asked the Board to support the autonomy of doctors.

Mr. Cyr inquired why the Board would support a bill that creates an adversarial relationship between the Board and its members, does not have a proper cost analysis, and the impact has not been fully vetted.

Ms. Graziano described the medical history of her family and explained that under SB 276, they would not be covered. She added that Mississippi and West Virginia are two states with

the strictest vaccination laws and they also have the highest infant mortality rates. She asked the Board to oppose SB 276.

Ms. Scholz, a mental health provider for Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health, expressed her opposition of SB 276. She explained that it takes away privacy, right to education, and affects the doctor-patient relationship. She concluded that she and the Yellow Vest Mamas will not comply.

Ms. Todesto commented that since vaccines have never been tested or compared to a double-blind placebo, pharmaceutical companies can never prove they are truly safe for every child.

Ms. Hofmaster pointed out that SB 277 aimed to protect medically fragile children and SB 276 will go after those medically fragile kids.

Mr. Johansen commented that if SB 276 passes it will make a statement that doctors cannot be trusted and the public should also not trust doctors. He asked the Board not to vote on this agenda item.

Ms. Cammarata shared her story of her child and his medical history. She noted that there may be many working moms that are going to have to quit their jobs to homeschool their children and noted this may have an impact on the economy.

Ms. Hill explained the medical history of her family and shared that if the bill goes through, she will lose her job and her children will not be able to go to school. She urged the Board to oppose SB 276.

Ms. Tarasyuk stated that the doctor-patient relationship should be protected and not given to a bureaucratic official. She stated her opposition.

Ms. Wills discussed the cost implication of SB 276, noting people leaving the state and shared that there are potential lawsuits against the Board.

Ms. Hampton pointed out that SB 276 was been modeled after the West Virginia vaccine law, which seems to be the gold standard for public health. She shared that there are many concerned West Virginians working to amend this law and allow physicians the right to practice medicine without the bureaucratic oversight.

Ms. Jauregui asked that the Board the trust in the physician-patient relationship and not to undermine it.

Ms. Yamamoto shared that she received a response from the CDC that she should talk with her doctor about her family member's specific condition with regard to vaccinations. She added that the CDC's contraindications and precautions are guidelines and not written in stone, rather it is up to the doctor.

Ms. Hathcock explained that her daughter would no longer have a medical exemption under SB 276. She added that this bill is a very slippery slope. She urged the Board to oppose SB 276.

Ms. Lopez, a mother of a vaccine injured child, provided additional details about her children. She asked the Board to oppose SB 276 since it will force families out of school and the state.

Ms. Carrion remarked that the exemptions need to be kept in the hands of physicians and not state workers who have no right to make this determination. She urged the Board to oppose this bill.

Ms. Coburn asked the Board to read her letter prior to voting on the matter. She shared that the CDC stated that they do not determine medical exemptions, rather they define contraindications. She added that CDC remarked that it is the medical provider's prerogative to determine if an exemption is warranted. She asked the Board to oppose SB 276.

Ms. Castro detailed her daughter's story and shared that under this law her siblings would not get exemptions. She asked the Board to protect the doctor-patient relationship and oppose the bill.

Dr. Song, a board-certified private practice pediatrician, commented that this bill will take away her decision-making power and for this reason, she strongly opposes it.

Ms. Kayne, a registered nurse, commented that nothing in the bill falls under evidence-based practice. She added that this bill will create a huge distrust in the medical profession and she asked the Board to oppose it.

Ms. Molchan reminded the Board that the majority of children who have medical exemptions have been vaccinated before and are now immunocompromised. She asked the Board to oppose SB 276.

Ms. DeMatteis, a mother, expressed her strong opposition of SB 276 since it goes against people's rights and freedom of choice. She added that it is not fair for children to be taken out of school and not receive the same experience or schooling as other children.

Ms. Landers, a homeschooling mother of three, asked the Board to oppose SB 276 and allow parents to have informed consent. She added that if passed, the bill will set a catastrophic precedent in regard to medical freedom and equal access to care.

Ms. Hildebrand, A Voice for Choice Advocacy, asked the Board to ask themselves how many doctors have been infringed upon and how many have the Board not been able to subpoena the records. She noted that obtaining medical records is one piece of the bill.

Ms. Hart, a U.S. Navy veteran, remarked that this bill violates the doctor-patient relationship, is unconstitutional, and one that she will not comply with if made law. She expressed her opposition and asked the Board to do the same.

Ms. Robi vocalized her opposition of SB 276 since it undermines Californians rights, does not allow doctors to do their job, and does not protect children that need the medical exemptions. She added that the manufacturer of the Measles, Mumps, and Rubella vaccine is currently under litigation for fraud.

Ms. Lopez commented that this bill indicates that the Board is incapable of governing physicians. She added that this bill is based on allegations from Facebook. She asked that the Board oppose SB 276.

Ms. Adams expressed her opposition of SB 276, asked the Board to oppose the bill and fact check Senator Pan.

Ms. Flores, a mother of two vaccine injured children, provided statistics of vaccination rates and inquired what danger Senator Pan is referring to in the information. She urged the Board to oppose SB 276.

Ms. Hartel asked the Board to oppose SB 276 to retain a physician's autonomy and authority.

Ms. Largent expressed her opposition of SB 276.

Ms. Barton, a mother of two medically fragile children, vocalized her opposition of this bill. She added that it is an overreach based on Senator Pan. She added that this bill is fiscally irresponsible.

Dr. Hawkins withdrew his second.

Ms. Lubiano commented that she would be open to supporting the bill with amendments.

Dr. Hawkins noted how impressed he was by the amount of concern brought forth by the public.

Mr. Warmoth suggested that the Board could support if amended if the amendment would look into the narrowing of reasons for an exemption.

Ms. Lubiano added that other amendments might include vaccine injuries, previous family history, and genetic predisposition supported by genetic testing.

Dr. Bholat echoed Dr. Hawkins concerns and added her concerns about the doctor-patient relationship. She requested additional information on epigenetics and inquired about the opinion of research scientists. She added that she is a supporter of vaccines and would support amendments to this bill.

Dr. Yip shared his concerns that a government employee would make this decision, not knowing who they are or what training they will have received. He also thought the CDC guidelines were too narrow and had concerns over patient confidentiality with the database. He added that there is a current problem with the Board not being able to obtain records.

Dr. GnanaDev remarked that he has not heard strong support or opposition and suggested a neutral position.

Ms. Kirchmeyer reiterated that she has heard that the CDC guidelines are too narrow and shared that the Board can support if amended.

Ms. Friedman inquired if a motion could be made to support the idea of vaccinations and the bill, but that there are reservations about CDPH.

Ms. Kirchmeyer answered that there needs to be specific amendments proposed if the Board takes a support if amended position.

Mr. Warmoth made a motion to support SB 276 in concept; s/ Dr. GnanaDev.

Ms. Kirchmeyer explained that the two areas of issue are the CDC guidelines being too narrow and the CDPH being the entity to review the exemptions.

Ms. Lubiano inquired about the timeline of when the decision had to be made.

Ms. Simoes explained that she can continue to work with the author's office, but that she needs to be clear about what amendments are needed. Ms. Simoes noted that the Board has expressed interest in getting the necessary information for investigations.

Ms. Kirchmeyer added that from discussion it seemed the Board would like the exemptions to be reviewed, however, there is uncertainty as to who should review the exemptions. Therefore the support would be for the release of medical records to help the Board with investigations and a review of the exemptions. She added that work would need to be done with the author's office in terms of the CDC guidelines.

Dr. Bholat reiterated that the Board's position will be to support in concept, but to raise the two issues that Ms. Kirchmeyer noted.

Dr. Yip added that he would like to know about the protection of the patient since that child could be discriminated against.

Ms. Simoes pointed out that she needs specific amendments and a bill cannot require a non-governmental entity to do something. Therefore, she confirmed that she will write a letter noting the concepts that the Board supports. She reiterated that the concepts that the Board

supports are that the medical exemptions need to be reviewed and that the Board obtain the records for investigations.

Motion carried (5-2-1; Bholat and Yip nay, Pines abstained, and Lawson absent).

Ms. Pines adjourned the meeting at 7:17 p.m.

Signature on File	8/8/19
Denise Pines, President	Date

Signature on File	8/8/19
Dr. Lewis, Vice President	Date

Signature on File	8/8/19
Kimberly Kirchmeyer, Executive Director	Date