

Dear Senator Burdick,

I'm writing to you in reference to HB 3063. I have specific concerns about the ability of this bill to recognize an individual's health history and to allow a physician to make modifications appropriate to that person's likelihood of being negatively impacted. I can regale you with my personal history and that of my son if it's of value to you.

- I am not against vaccination. My strong concern is that people like my son and I may be compelled by the state to receive vaccinations to which we have experienced adverse reactions, even over our doctor's objection.
- This law overrides my doctor's findings regarding my health care, leaving the final decision of whether a treatment is dangerous for someone in the hands of the Oregon Medical Board, a political entity. I want my health care decisions at the local level, and based on my individual needs and concerns first. Medicine and health are not one-size-fits-all – doctors must be allowed to modify any medical treatment to avoid harm, death, or non-value-added treatment. That should never be a political decision.
- This law requires a doctor to ignore family history – only previous diagnosis or reaction qualifies someone for exemption, which you don't have at birth. Deliberately ignoring known potential risk factors like family history would be malpractice for any other condition. This goes against best practices for medicine which must take familial, environmental and other factors into account to anticipate adverse reactions, not merely react to them.
- The apparent vaccine failure rate is higher than it should be given the stated success rates and assumption of permanent immunity. Simply requiring a shot doesn't mean it worked – my son never developed mumps antibodies after all the required vaccinations plus extras, whooping cough is known to mutate, and other immunities seem to wear off. This warrants investigation if herd immunity is the goal. Maybe genetics plays a role, which brings us back to laws that should never prevent the implementation of new science.
- Vaccine research and documentation is insufficiently controlled to formulate an accurate picture of potential vaccine injury and efficacy, particularly over the long term. Specifically, they are not tested as administered and reporting of adverse events is spotty and subjective. Consequently, it's hard to know what the risk actually is to the individual. This may play a role in vaccine hesitancy as well. I would like to see states increase pressure in this area.

I appreciate your interest in the public health and your time if you actually read this. But please do not take away our doctors' ability to make individual modifications where they are justified by family history, medical issues, or other entirely reasonable scientific reasons if there's an expectation of potential harm. And please put pressure on the FDA and other agencies to perform or require the research to back up their assertions of efficacy and safety because the first doesn't seem to reflect the claims made, and the second is not documented with consistency. We would all benefit from that.

Best regards,  
Anita Cate Smyth