

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
To: [HTHTestimony](#)
Cc: ck.hamilton@gmail.com
Subject: Submitted testimony for SB2070 on Feb 10, 2014 13:15PM
Date: Sunday, February 09, 2014 12:56:15 PM

SB2070

Submitted on: 2/9/2014

Testimony for HTH on Feb 10, 2014 13:15PM in Conference Room 229

| Submitted By | Organization | Testifier Position | Present at Hearing |
|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Clair Hamilton Araujo | HSNP | Support | No |

Comments: HSNP supports this measure with reservations, as there is not currently unanimous agreement in the HSNP membership in regards to this measure. We request that the committee consider a grandfathering provision for NDs who have been practicing natural childbirth for 10 years or more. Thank you for the opportunity to testify on Senate Bill No. 2070.

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov



HAWAII MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

1360 S. Beretania Street, Suite 200, Honolulu, Hawaii 96814
Phone (808) 536-7702 Fax (808) 528-2376 www.hmaonline.net

DATE: Monday, February 10, 2014
TIME: 1:15PM
PLACE: Conference Room 229

TO:

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH

Senator Josh Green, Chair

Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Vice Chair

FROM: Hawaii Medical Association

Dr. Walton Shim, MD, President

Dr. Linda Rasmussen, MD, Legislative Co-Chair

Dr. Ron Keinitz, DO, Legislative Co-Chair

Dr. Christopher Flanders, DO, Executive Director

Lauren Zirbel, Community and Government Relations

Re: SB 2070

Position: Support intent but prefer SB 2569.

HMA respects the right of women to have home births. HMA also believe it is necessary to have some licensure standards to ensure the safety of mothers and babies.

HMA prefers SB 2569 as it would regulate all home birth providers and provide more safety to mothers and babies.

The HMA is in support of this measure as a way to regulate practitioners who are providing services for money but have little to no clinical training in obstetrics. **If you have to get a license to cut hair you should have to get a license to deliver a baby.**

We offer this testimony because of the number of phone calls we have received from providers who have taken care of home births gone terribly wrong. Women and partially delivered babies end up in the ER and OBGYN's take on a considerable amount of liability to try to save the lives of both the mother and the baby. Often times when home births go wrong, and the provider has no training in obstetrics, the baby and/or mother end up dead or severely debilitated.

Officers

*President - Walton Shim, MD President-Elect – Robert Sloan
Secretary - Thomas Kosasa, MD Immediate Past President – Stephen Kemble, MD
Treasurer – Brandon Lee, MD Executive Director – Christopher Flanders, DO*

Many other states regulate home birth providers. **SB 2569 will allow mothers who choose home birth to have the security of knowing that in order to hang out a shingle, a home birth provider must meet state licensing standards.**

The most recent and largest study to date reveals that there is a four-fold increased risk of neonatal death associated with home birth. In addition, there is a seven-fold increased risk of neonatal death for first time mothers who deliver at home and a ten – fold increased risk for pregnancies more than 41 weeks gestation. [Grunebaum A, Chervenak F, etal. Society for Maternal Fetal Medicine Abstract. February 7, 2014.]

Currently, there is no licensure, and therefore no patient safety rules and regulations regarding home birth. There are many complications that can occur, particularly with high-risk pregnancies. However, even low-risk pregnancies can quickly, within a few minutes or even seconds, become high-risk during the labor and delivery process.

Twenty-six states have some kind of legal recognition of Certified Professional Midwives. Of those twenty-six, seventeen states have licensure based on the CPM certification. Seven states have established educational requirements and qualifications for professional status and legal recognition that pre-date the existence of CPM; all of these states now use the NARM (CPM) written exam as a critical part of the requirements for licensure. ¹

Please do something to protect our mothers and babies.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony.

¹ North American Registry of Midwives. <http://narm.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/State-Licensure-of-CPMs2012.pdf>

**PRESENTATION OF THE
BOARD OF NATUROPATHIC MEDICINE**

TO THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON HEALTH

TWENTY-SEVENTH LEGISLATURE
Regular Session of 2014

Monday, February 10, 2014
1:15 p.m.

TESTIMONY ON SENATE BILL NO. 2070, RELATING TO NATUROPATHY.

TO THE HONORABLE JOSH GREEN, M.D., CHAIR,
AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE:

My name is Dr. Kevin Gibson, Chairperson of the Board of Naturopathic Medicine ("Board"). The Board appreciates the opportunity to testify in opposition to Senate Bill No. 2070, relating to Naturopathy.

The purpose of Senate Bill No. 2070 is to require naturopathic physicians to obtain a certificate of specialty practice from the Board prior to practicing naturopathic childbirth attendance.

It is the Board's position that pursuant to sections 455-1 and 455-8, Hawaii Revised Statutes, natural childbirth/obstetrics falls within a naturopathic physician's scope of practice. Furthermore, section 16-88-80(a)(6)(A), Hawaii Administrative Rules, requires that a naturopathic physician shall maintain proficiency and competence, and be diligent in the provision and administration of patient care. Naturopathic physicians are also required to recognize and exercise professional judgment within the limits of the naturopathic physician's qualifications, and collaborate with others, seek counsel, or make referrals as appropriate.

Therefore, the Board opposes Senate Bill No. 2070.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on Senate Bill No. 2070.

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
To: [HTHTestimony](#)
Cc: admin@hawaiiind.org
Subject: Submitted testimony for SB2070 on Feb 10, 2014 13:15PM
Date: Sunday, February 09, 2014 12:26:37 PM

SB2070

Submitted on: 2/9/2014

Testimony for HTH on Feb 10, 2014 13:15PM in Conference Room 229

| Submitted By | Organization | Testifier Position | Present at Hearing |
|--------------------------|---|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Karen Frangos, PT, ND | Hawaii Society of Naturopathic Physicians | Support | No |

Comments: SB2070: HSNP supports this measure with reservations, as there is not currently unanimous agreement in the HSNP membership with regards to this measure. We request that the committee consider a grandfathering provision for Naturopathic Physicians who have been practicing natural childbirth for 10 years or more. Thank you for the opportunity to testify on Senate Bill No. 2070.

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
To: [HTHTestimony](#)
Cc: angrybraids@aol.com
Subject: *Submitted testimony for SB2070 on Feb 10, 2014 13:15PM*
Date: Saturday, February 08, 2014 11:55:32 PM

SB2070

Submitted on: 2/8/2014

Testimony for HTH on Feb 10, 2014 13:15PM in Conference Room 229

| Submitted By | Organization | Testifier Position | Present at Hearing |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Amelia Ensign | Individual | Oppose | No |

Comments:

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov

David Schoder

REGULAR SESSION OF 2014

For: Honorable chair and Committee members of Health and committee on commerce and consumer protection

Hearing: February 10, 2014 1:15 p.m.(date) Rm 229

RE: SB 2070 Relating to Natropathy – IN OPPOSITION

Aloha,

My name is David Schoder. I don't support further certification of NDs doing home births at this time. Nds have been attending births as a part of the scope of their practice since chapter 455 became law in 1925. If further regulation is needed (and we do not believe that it is needed) then to do it as one unified act with all the home birth practitioners. Unify, not divide. Homebirth is a midwifery model, not a medical model. Please refer to testimony given for SB 2569 and Sb2569 Sd1.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Aloha, David Schoder

Abigail Schoder

REGULAR SESSION OF 2014

For: Honorable Senate Committee Health Chair Green, Vice Chair Baker and Committee Members, Honorable Chair and Committee members of Health, Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection and Judiciary and Labor

Hearing: February 10, 2014 1:30 p.m.(date) Rm 229

RE: SB 2569 and SB2569 SD1 Relating to Home Birth – IN OPPOSITION

Aloha,

My name is Abigail Schoder. I had a home birth on the island of Kauai, am a registered voter in the state of Hawaii and am a long time supporter of a woman's right to birth in a way that feels safe to her, whether that be a home birth or at a hospital. Personally for me that choice was a home birth.

I know women who choose to birth at home and other women who choose to birth in a hospital. I support them all to make the choice that feels best and most safe for them individually. I am not opposed to hospital-based births if it is what the woman feels more comfortable with. I would not and do not expect that I should have the right to tell her where she has to birth. It wouldn't be fair that she be legally bound to HAVE to have a home birth if she felt safer in the hospital. I expect the same freedom of choice in being able to choose to birth at home. This choice is in fact both the mother (and the father) and the child's BIRTH RIGHT, literally. We use the term "birthright" in our language to represent different things. This freedom of choice (where and how a woman births)is fundamentally at the core of the definition of "Birth right".

My labor and childbirth was a wonderful and challenging experience for me. There were moments of it that presented challenges. My midwives were fully competent, experienced and prepared in how to handle the situation to support both my baby and myself in having a safe delivery. They watched for signs and signals that they needed to be aware of and competently took action in a timely manner to ensure safety for both my baby and I.

Part of why I trusted my midwives is because I did my "homework" and checked out their backgrounds, experience etc. to make sure I was making a wise choice in who I would be working with in this very important process of birthing life. It is unfortunate that some people may call themselves a "midwife" and they don't have integrity to back that up. All midwives are not created equal and it is the responsibility of the client to do her research, homework, interviews etc. to make her own informed and competent decision.

This bill does not offer a woman support in making this decision. I strongly feel that it would cripple many highly skilled midwives from doing their job, not to mention rob women the right to experience the highly supportive and

empowering experience of birthing in a way that is right for her and her baby. Birthing is a full fledged initiation for a woman and her child, one that deserves to be honored and supported not interfered and controlled.

I strongly oppose SB 2569 for the following reasons.

1. On its face, this bill is inaccurate. It cites a flawed study, and it suggests home birth is dangerous and unsafe. I join other home birth practitioners, mothers and advocates to correct that notion. We realize that we have a responsibility to provide data and information about our home birth practices, our training, and our experiences to the legislature and community-at-large.

2. This bill currently tries to define a scope of practice without an in depth understanding of the various practitioners, roles and responsibilities involved in home birth. The medical hospital-based model it imposes doesn't take into account the population it is regulating and doesn't accurately represent different models of home birthing, each with unique traditions, scopes of practice, varying types of practitioners and their educational backgrounds, safety protocols and standards of care that are already in place.

3. The Home Birth Safety Board is also based on a medical model, and it does not reflect the culture and practice of home birth. It doesn't even reflect the participants of home birth

practice. This bill assumes there is no oversight over home birth; in fact, midwives have the capacity to govern themselves.

4. As written, this bill would essentially eliminate the option of finding a legal home birth attendant. It is the rite/right of every birthing mother to choose where,

Abigail Schoder

REGULAR SESSION OF 2014

For: Honorable Senate Committee Health Chair Green, Vice Chair Baker and Committee Members, Honorable Chair and Committee members of Health, Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection and Judiciary and Labor

Hearing: February 10, 2014 1:30 p.m.(date) Rm 229

RE: SB 2569 and SB2569 SD1 Relating to Home Birth – IN OPPOSITION

Aloha,

My name is Abigail Schoder. I had a home birth on the island of Kauai, am a registered voter in the state of Hawaii and am a long time supporter of a woman's right to birth in a way that feels safe to her, whether that be a home birth or at a hospital. Personally for me that choice was a home birth.

I know women who choose to birth at home and other women who choose to birth in a hospital. I support them all to make the choice that feels best and most safe for them individually. I am not opposed to hospital-based births if it is what the woman feels more comfortable with. I would not and do not expect that I should have the right to tell her where she has to birth. It wouldn't be fair that she be legally bound to HAVE to have a home birth if she felt safer in the hospital. I expect the same freedom of choice in being able to choose to birth at home. This choice is in fact both the mother (and the father) and the child's BIRTH RIGHT, literally. We use the term "birthright" in our language to represent different things. This freedom of choice (where and how a woman births) is fundamentally at the core of the definition of "Birth right".

My labor and childbirth was a wonderful and challenging experience for me. There were moments of it that presented challenges. My midwives were fully competent, experienced and prepared in how to handle the situation to support both my baby and myself in having a safe delivery. They watched for signs and signals that they needed to be aware of and competently took action in a timely manner to ensure safety for both my baby and I.

Part of why I trusted my midwives is because I did my "homework" and checked out their backgrounds, experience etc. to make sure I was making a wise choice in who I would be working with in this very important process of birthing life. It is unfortunate that some people may call themselves a "midwife" and they don't have integrity to back that up. All midwives are not created equal and it is the responsibility of the client to do her research, homework, interviews etc. to make her own informed and competent decision.

This bill does not offer a woman support in making this decision. I strongly feel that it would cripple many highly skilled midwives from doing their job, not to mention rob women the right to experience the highly supportive and empowering experience of birthing in a way that is right for her and her baby. Birthing is a full fledged initiation for a woman and her child, one that deserves to be honored and supported not interfered

and controlled.

I strongly oppose SB 2569 for the following reasons.

1. On its face, this bill is inaccurate. It cites a flawed study, and it suggests home birth is dangerous and unsafe. I join other home birth practitioners, mothers and advocates to correct that notion. We realize that we have a responsibility to provide data and information about our home birth practices, our training, and our experiences to the legislature and community-at-large.
2. This bill currently tries to define a scope of practice without an in depth understanding of the various practitioners, roles and responsibilities involved in home birth. The medical hospital-based model it imposes doesn't take into account the population it is regulating and doesn't accurately represent different models of home birthing, each with unique traditions, scopes of practice, varying types of practitioners and their educational backgrounds, safety protocols and standards of care that are already in place.
3. The Home Birth Safety Board is also based on a medical model, and it does not reflect the culture and practice of home birth. It doesn't even reflect the participants of home birth practice. This bill assumes there is no oversight over home birth; in fact, midwives have

9 February 2014

My purpose in writing this testimony today is to speak out against bills SB2569 * SB2569 SD1 and SB2070 * SCR25.

I urge all voting members of the house to vote "NO" against these two measures, as they undermine a woman's right to choose the time, place and person(s) who will deliver her baby and is the antithesis of what the ACA and the USC intend.

Furthermore, these bills fail to address the very real safety concerns and increased rate of infant mortality associated with the increased use of interventions that are the hallmark of care by medical doctors at medical facilities.

My personal experience compels me to support other women in their quest for sovereignty over their bodies. In 1986, during what was supposed to be a routine pre-natal examination, healthcare providers at Tripler Army Medical Center determined that I was in pre-term labor and I was admitted into their ICU.

Because Tripler's neonatal unit was not sophisticated enough to care for a fetus that young (28 weeks), within three days I was transferred to Kapiolani Medical Center.

At Kapiolani I was given the highest level of medical care from the facilities and the staff, including Drs. Ralph Hale (who delivered my son, on February 10, 1987) and Robin Willcourt (a visiting specialist).

Were it not fetal distress at 35 weeks and an intervening C-section (from my naval to my pubic bone – the most severe type of incision, through three layers of muscle), I would have delivered vaginally and without anesthesia – as originally planned.

In spite of this episode and the continuing complications related to abruptio placenta that followed me into my second pregnancy, Dr. Stephen Lin, a physician at Kapiolani, who treated me throughout my second high-risk pregnancy, allowed me to deliver vaginally (VBAC).

It was a thrill and a blessing for my spouse and myself, as were both able to participate in the birth of our daughter - him helping to cut the umbilical cord and me being rewarded with the chance to breast-feed in the delivery room.

That was in 1991. I still have the photos, and because I was not sedated, I remember every minute of my daughter's birth.

And, while "medicine" has advanced quite a bit, somehow, political attitudes about women making choices about their bodies doesn't seem to have kept pace with those advances. Even worse, it appears that we are sliding backward in that regard.

The bill sponsors would have you believe that theirs is a quest to ensure patient safety and not curtail the right to choose. I see very little merit to their argument and more fear mongering, than anything.

As a mother and grandmother, and as a long time advocate of traditional healthcare practices (upon which contemporary medicine is built), I disagree with the decision to impose further (and unwarranted) legislation onto women and their healthcare providers involved in the birthing process, and this is why:

- Less than 1% of all births occur at home – the majority occur in the hospital
- The USA – though it ranks #1 in healthcare costs – is #45 in infant mortality (which means that 44 other countries have lower infant mortality rates) and that's for services rendered in a hospital facility
- The leading cause of infant mortality within the first year of life is birth defects and there is nothing to correlate birth defects with at home births, rather birth defects are often associated with much younger/older mothers, as well as higher rates of interventions at medical facilities
- The second leading cause of infant mortality within the first year of life is premature/low birth weight – again this is not due to at-home births and is often correlated with births associated with interventions, such as hospital births
- Birth defects and premature/low birth rates account for 37% of infant mortality
- 1 in every 8 infants born in the USA is pre-term
- A 2004 report revealed that 16% births were to teens under 18 and 17% births to women over 40 – most will deliver in a hospital, not at home
- Pre-term infants are 15x more likely to die in the first year
- Every year 32K infants born before 32 weeks and are 75X more likely to die
- On average, a bay is born/minute to a teen mother in the USA

- Besides birth defects, premature/low birth weight, other factors, such as infections, smoking, drugs, extreme weight and stress contribute to infant mortality
- Obesity rates for women 18-44 has increased from 12.6% in 1995, to 21.7% in 2005
- The use of interventions, such as induction, epidural and C-sections have increased dramatically since 1965
- C-section rates went from 4.5% in 1965, to 31.1% in 2006, a 50% increase from 20.7% in 1996
- The World Health Organization (WHO) recommends that the optimal rate of interventions is between 5-10% of births and that rates over 15% may cause more harm than good
- The rates of induced labor have gone up 135% from 1990-2005 (and reporting is suspected to be underestimated by 45%)
- According to one study, “planned c-sections may lead to medically caused prematurity”
- The rates of pre-term births appear to correlate with planned C-sections – so, the question we should be asking ourselves is – is hospital birth, with all its attendant “interventions”, truly safer than at home birth? Or, does at home birth, because of the lack of interventions, present a safer – and more traditional – option for birthing?

For all these reasons and for one simple one – there is no good justification – I urge all lawmakers to vote “NO” to these and any bills that would either confuse, cherry pick, or otherwise manipulate the data in order to undermine a woman’s right to chose and force her to give birth in a medical facility.

Perhaps the real questions we should be asking ourselves an lawmakers is:

Why - with all the data that suggests that hospital interventions and other factors, such as a woman’s age and higher rates of female obesity, are the true culprits of increased rates of infant mortality and not at home births - are hospital births preferred by our lawmakers, over at home births? Is this legislative decision being made to enhance the safety of at home births, or discourage women from this choice and thus force them back into a hospital setting, where hospital providers will chose for the mother? What does the law have against tradition and women’s choice?

Mahalo.

I, Babatunji Heath, oppose this bill because it seeks to restrict the legal rights of Naturopathic Doctors as protected under Hawaii law and would put in place a certification process not required of Medical Doctors, OBs, Midwives, Doulas or any other health care professional who might attend and assist a 'natural' or normal birth there by creating an unjustified double standard and making this proposed law difficult if not impossible to enforce.

Further more, the bill provides no clear definition of "naturopathic child birth attendance" which again would make this proposed law difficult if not impossible to enforce.

As a concerned and voting citizen of Hawaii I appreciate Senator Green's concern for mothers and their babies. However, if safer births and healthier mothers and babies are truly his and the State of Hawaii's goal then we should be examining all births and birth attendants in Hawaii as well as the education and health care that is provided to our mothers to be. Fear mongering based on false data and rumors is not responsible leadership and does not serve to truly protect people. Education, communication and cooperation are needed to improve the safety and quality of all births in Hawaii.

To: Honorable Chair and Committee members of Health and Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection,

Hearing date 2-10-14 1:15pm Rm 229
RE: SB2070 Relating to Naturopathy

I am an educated professional (Chemical Engineering BS) who, upon becoming pregnant with my first son, decided to research why the U.S. ranks 50th in the world for maternal mortality (ref. <http://www.amnestyusa.org/sites/default/files/deadlydeliveryoneyear.pdf>).

Maternal and infant morbidity (and infant mortality) are also terrible. I found out that a midwife-based model of care with the norm being out-of-hospital births is the model followed by the safest countries for mothers to birth their babies. There are many varied reasons why this is, but I chose to birth my son out-of-hospital because of this data, and because I felt safe doing so after researching and finding an extremely experienced midwife on island.

This bill will criminalize all midwives who are not Certified Nurse-Midwives, including the one I used who has 25+ years of experience and is a Naturopathic Physician. There are many reasons why I think this bill is a terrible idea, but the biggest is that it limits women's choices to birth their babies in the way they feel safest.

Mahalo,
Jill Sims
2347 Beckwith St.
Honolulu, HI 96822

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
To: [HTHTestimony](#)
Cc: becky.hamilton@me.com
Subject: Submitted testimony for SB2070 on Feb 10, 2014 13:15PM
Date: Sunday, February 09, 2014 12:40:39 AM

SB2070

Submitted on: 2/9/2014

Testimony for HTH on Feb 10, 2014 13:15PM in Conference Room 229

| Submitted By | Organization | Testifier Position | Present at Hearing |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Becky Hamilton | Individual | Oppose | No |

Comments: I strongly oppose this bill.

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov

To: Honorable Chair and Committee members of Health and Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection,

Hearing date 2-10-14 1:15pm rm 229

RE: SB2070 Relating to Naturopathy (Oppose)

To Whom It May Concern:

I do not support further certification of NDs practicing and supporting home births at this time. NDs have been attending home births as part of their scope of practice since Chap 455 became law in 1925. If further regulation is needed (and we do not believe there is a need) then to do it as one unified act with ALL the home birth practitioners. Unify, not divide. Home birth is a midwifery model, not a medical model. Please refer to testimony given for SB2569 SD1!

Mahalo,

Jennifer Shim

Makiki/Punchbowl

IN OPPOSITION TO SB2070, Relating to Naturopathy

Regular Session of 2014

Hearing on Monday, February 10, 2014 at 1:15 p.m. in Room 229

For: Honorable Chair and Vice Chair and members of Health Committee and Commerce and Consumer Protection Committee

Dear Sirs and Madams,

My name is Ben Kinsey and I am a registered voter and a home birth father to three wonderful children. I strongly oppose SB2070.

I don't support further certification of Naturopathic Doctors doing home births at this time. NDs have been attending home births as part of their scope of practice since Chap 455 became law in 1925. If further regulation is needed (and we do not believe there is a need) then to do it as one unified act with ALL the home birth practitioners. Unify, not divide. Home birth is a midwifery model, not a medical model. Please refer to my testimony given against SB2569 and SB2569 SD1!

Thank you for your time and effort in this matter.

Yours truly,
Ben Kinsey

Amy K. Halas
PO Box 925
Kane'ohe, Hawai'i
96744

February 8, 2014

To: Honorable Chair and Committee members of Health and Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection

RE: SB2070 Relating to Naturopathy
Hearing date: 2-10-14 1:15pm, room 229

Dear Honorable Chair and Committee Members,

I am writing to express my opposition to Senate Bill 2070.

I do not support additional certification of Naturopathic Doctors (ND's) doing home births at this time. ND's have been attending to home births as part of their scope of practice since Hawai'i Revised Statutes Chapter 455 was initially enacted in 1925. If further regulation is necessary, then please initiate legislation as one unified act that will include all practitioners involved with home birth.

A woman's decision on where and with whom to give birth is very much her own. In light of the cascade of interventions that follows a medical induction for the purpose of forcing labor, thus contributing to the alarming rate of Cesarean Sections, home birth has become a much safer option for women and their newborns. Naturopathic physicians have been attending home births in Hawai'i for nearly a century. Additional certification is not necessary at this time.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Amy K. Halas

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
To: [HTHTestimony](#)
Cc: unaviami@yahoo.com
Subject: Submitted testimony for SB2070 on Feb 10, 2014 13:15PM
Date: Sunday, February 09, 2014 8:15:58 AM

SB2070

Submitted on: 2/9/2014

Testimony for HTH on Feb 10, 2014 13:15PM in Conference Room 229

| Submitted By | Organization | Testifier Position | Present at Hearing |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Bryna Storch | Individual | Oppose | No |

Comments: stop this already, enough attacks on alternative medical treatments. we need regulation of the mainstream medical industry and their numerous causes of malpractice and financial fraud of patients.

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov

To: Honorable Chair and Committee members of Health and Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection,
2. Hearing date 2-10-14 1:15pm rm 229
3. RE: SB2070 Relating to Naturopathy
4. Oppose

I am strongly opposed to this bill because its purported objective is to make homebirth “safer” in Hawaii, by requiring the certification of Naturopathic Doctors in order to do homebirth. There is zero indication that homebirth is dangerous at all, and this superfluous requirement is another obstacle for birth practitioners to serve the community. Naturopathic Doctors have been attending births for almost one hundred years, and are vital to the homebirth community. There is no need to restrict the practice of NDs attending homebirth, and it is unconscionable that our birth care givers are being systemically targeted. This is an effort to push our midwives out of practice, and history shows that when the medical establishment takes these kinds of measures, mothers and babies suffer.

IF YOU WANT TO MAKE BIRTH SAFER IN HAWAII, THEN START WITH THE HOSPITALS.

Women have a basic right to science-based maternity care. In the interest of safety, and the best interest of mothers and babies, we should examine this issue much more closely. The science clearly says that vaginal births after most previous cesarean sections are safe, and women should not be barred from birthing in the safety and sanctity of their chosen space when the risk of a uterine rupture is less than 2%. If we ban women seeking a VBAC (Vaginal Birth after Cesarean) from birthing outside of the hospital, then we are also limiting their options of achieving a non-surgical birth. Many hospitals in our state have policies that disallow VBACs, even though there is more than sufficient evidence to prove its safety. These restrictive policies are not supported by the National Institute of Health or by ACOG. If we truly want to make birth safer for women, then the first place to start should be in the hospitals, which have a C-section rate of over 30%. A cesarean section is major abdominal surgery, and carries risks for the mother and infant as well as a long recovery time. In fact, only one hospital in our state even qualifies as “Baby Friendly”, as outlined by UNICEF/WHO’s Baby-Friendly Hospital Initiative.” Any effort to legislate safety into birth should start with ensuring that hospitals are adhering to science-based pre-natal and maternity care. To single out the midwifery model of care is absurd, and not supported by any evidence of negligence. We need an informational hearing to review studies and examine data, especially data pertaining to our own unique population.

This bill does NOT make homebirth safer. It makes homebirth harder to achieve, and forces women into hospitals when there is no medical need. It restricts a woman’s right to choose where to birth and with whom to birth.

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
To: [HTHTestimony](#)
Cc: mikeylovesit@hotmail.com
Subject: *Submitted testimony for SB2070 on Feb 10, 2014 13:15PM*
Date: Sunday, February 09, 2014 11:36:58 AM

SB2070

Submitted on: 2/9/2014

Testimony for HTH on Feb 10, 2014 13:15PM in Conference Room 229

| Submitted By | Organization | Testifier Position | Present at Hearing |
|--------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Christian michael Cahill | Individual | Oppose | No |

Comments:

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
To: [HTHTestimony](#)
Cc: dulce.menta@live.com
Subject: Submitted testimony for SB2070 on Feb 10, 2014 13:15PM
Date: Saturday, February 08, 2014 8:14:54 PM

SB2070

Submitted on: 2/8/2014

Testimony for HTH on Feb 10, 2014 13:15PM in Conference Room 229

| Submitted By | Organization | Testifier Position | Present at Hearing |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| alexandra | Individual | Oppose | No |

Comments: In opposition of restricting naturopaths.

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov

Committees on Health

Re: SB2070 relating to Naturopathy

Monday 1:15pm Rm 229

Aloha Hon Chairs Green, Vice Chair Baker and committee members:

My Name is Darrow Hand and I am a naturopathic physician. While I support the intent of SB2070, I oppose the current revision.

Safety is a major concern for all pregnancies and I think that collaboration between health practitioners will better serve patients. In reading through SB2070 such collaboration seemed lacking and thus I oppose the bill. Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Sincerely,

Darrow Hand, ND

1. To: Honorable Chair and Committee members of Health and Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection,
2. Hearing date 2-10-14 1:15 pm, Rm. 229
3. RE: SB2070 Relating to Naturopathy
4. Oppose
5. I do not support the requirement of further certification for naturopathic physicians who attend home births. If further regulation is needed (and I do not believe there is a need), then regulation should be passed in one unified act with ALL home birth practitioners included. Again, I do not believe further restrictions should be enacted for home births; please see my testimony for SB2569 and SB2569 SD1 Relating to Home Birth.

To: Honorable Chair and Committee members of Health and Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection,
Hearing date 2-10-14 1:15pm rm 229
RE: SB2070 Relating to Naturopathy
Oppose

I don't support further certification of NDs doing home births at this time. NDs have been attending home births as part of their scope of practice since Chap 455 became law in 1925. If further regulation is needed (and we do not believe there is a need) then to do it as one unified act with ALL the home birth practitioners. Unify, not divide. Home birth is a midwifery model, not a medical model.

Please refer to testimony given for SB2569 SD1!

Denise Karabinus
Honolulu, HI

DATE: February 8, 2014

TO: Honorable Chair and Committee members of the Committee on Health,

RE: SB2070 Relating to Naturopathy

I am submitting testimony in opposition to this bill.

The practice of midwifery in out of hospital settings may be obtained via different paths based on a practitioner's training. While the intent of this measure may be to protect the health and well being of childbearing families, this particular measure is unnecessary given the current training already in place for naturopathic physicians specializing in this field.

It is encouraged that naturopathic physicians practicing midwifery be included as part of the out of hospital practitioners as defined in SB 2569 SD1. It is further suggested that SB 2569 SD1 be tabled and that a committee of practitioners and community members skilled in and familiar with out of hospital birth be created to further study and create appropriate regulations to monitor, promote, and support the safe practice of out of hospital birth in Hawaii.

Thank you for your support in opposition to this bill.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Eiko Cusick
RN, MPH, student nurse-midwife, homebirth mother of two sons

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
To: [HTHTestimony](#)
Cc: billgail@retiredinparadise.net
Subject: Submitted testimony for SB2070 on Feb 10, 2014 13:15PM
Date: Sunday, February 09, 2014 11:30:09 AM

SB2070

Submitted on: 2/9/2014

Testimony for HTH on Feb 10, 2014 13:15PM in Conference Room 229

| Submitted By | Organization | Testifier Position | Present at Hearing |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Gail Jackson | Individual | Oppose | No |

Comments: Aloha Senators, I certainly support Naturopathic doctors to attend births. I have been supported by Naturopathic doctors for more than 20 years. Alaska treats Naturopaths more equitably than Hawaii. Hawaii should step up! Please vote NO.
Mahalo, Gail Jackson

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
To: [HTHTestimony](#)
Cc: h96744@gmail.com
Subject: Submitted testimony for SB2070 on Feb 10, 2014 13:15PM
Date: Saturday, February 08, 2014 4:15:59 PM

SB2070

Submitted on: 2/8/2014

Testimony for HTH on Feb 10, 2014 13:15PM in Conference Room 229

| Submitted By | Organization | Testifier Position | Present at Hearing |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Heather Fowler | Individual | Oppose | No |

Comments: To: Honorable Chair and Committee members of Health and Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection, Hearing date 2-10-14 1:15pm Rm 229 RE: SB2070 Relating to Naturopathy Oppose I strongly Oppose this bill. I do not support further certification of NDs doing home births. NDs have been attending home births as part of their scope of practice since Chap 455 became law in 1925. If further regulation is needed (and we do not believe there is a need) then to do it as one unified act with ALL the home birth practitioners. Unify, not divide. Home birth is a midwifery model, not a medical model. Please also refer to testimony given for SB2569 SD1 Thank you, Heather Fowler RN, BSN, MBA, ADN.

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
To: [HTHTestimony](#)
Cc: bonbon_337@hotmail.com
Subject: *Submitted testimony for SB2070 on Feb 10, 2014 13:15PM*
Date: Saturday, February 08, 2014 9:23:20 PM

SB2070

Submitted on: 2/8/2014

Testimony for HTH on Feb 10, 2014 13:15PM in Conference Room 229

| Submitted By | Organization | Testifier Position | Present at Hearing |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Bonnie Elledge | Individual | Oppose | No |

Comments:

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
To: [HTHTestimony](#)
Cc: drheather@drheathernd.com
Subject: *Submitted testimony for SB2070 on Feb 10, 2014 13:15PM*
Date: Sunday, February 09, 2014 10:04:41 AM

SB2070

Submitted on: 2/9/2014

Testimony for HTH on Feb 10, 2014 13:15PM in Conference Room 229

| Submitted By | Organization | Testifier Position | Present at Hearing |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Heather Manley | Individual | Support | No |

Comments:

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov

To: Honorable Chair and Committee members of Health, Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection and Judiciary and Labor,
Hearing date 2-10-14 1:30pm rm 229
RE: SB2569 and SB2569 SD1 Relating to Home Birth

Dear Honorable Chair and Committee Members of Health, Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection, and Judiciary and Labor:

I oppose this bill. I believe it will erode my family's safety, quality of care and access to care.

I am making this statement based on serious and lengthy research and data, anecdotal evidence and personal experience. All of these things lead me to believe that home birth is the best option for me because the hospital system cares less about me and my family than my midwife, cannot provide any service that is better than that provided by my midwife and doula (except in emergencies), and has much to profit by this legislation.

With regard to the data, there is an abundance that shows how a hospital delivery, in most cases, is less safe than a homebirth with a trained midwife and/or doula. The data that stands out the most to me relates to c-section rates in the US and how they compare to c-section rates in the rest of the modern world. The data shows that these high rates are not necessary and are very detrimental to the long-term health and mortality of mothers. What would your mother say?

Furthermore, a legitimate concern about quality of care is my ability to make a connection to my care provider. I can achieve a much better connection to my midwife and doula than to an obstetrician because of the time they are willing to spend with me and because their way of thinking aligns closer to my own.

With regard to access to care, clearly this bill will reduce my choices.

Frankly, I would expect this bill from the Republicans, not such a strong Democratic government as ours. To me, this bill is clearly bad for the common person and good for the business interests of the medical industry in Hawaii. If you are truly interested in safety, this bill should be laughed into oblivion.

Kindest regards,

Jason Sears

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
To: [HTHTestimony](#)
Cc: candee675@gmail.com
Subject: Submitted testimony for SB2070 on Feb 10, 2014 13:15PM
Date: Saturday, February 08, 2014 1:41:55 PM

SB2070

Submitted on: 2/8/2014

Testimony for HTH on Feb 10, 2014 13:15PM in Conference Room 229

| Submitted By | Organization | Testifier Position | Present at Hearing |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Candace Mendoza | Individual | Oppose | No |

Comments: I don't support further certification. Home births is a midwifery model, not a medic modal.

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov

REGULAR SESSION OF 2014

For: Honorable Chair and Committee members of Health, Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection and Judiciary and Labor
Hearing 2/10/14 @ 1:15pm Rm 229

RE: **SB 2070 Relating to Naturopathic Midwives – IN OPPOSITION**

My husband and I are both college educated and successful small business owners. We moved to Hawaii in 2006 to start our family. Once we became pregnant and after much research and hospital tours, we chose to deliver both of our babies in our Kailua home in 2008 and 2011. Moving here from the mainland, I was surprised there was no birth center and had to REALLY search for an alternative to a hospital birth. We chose to deliver with a pair of Naturopaths, feeling completely safe and confident in our choice of doctors.

After our first child in 2008, I became very involved in the birthing community because I believe families should have MORE CHOICE of where and with whom they can birth with. I have a unique perspective, being an active doula in the community for hospital deliveries, AND working in an out of hospital setting as I work towards my CPM license. There are stark differences even in the midwife's model of care when comparing in hospital and out of hospital settings. And no matter *where* or *with whom* a woman chooses to birth, there are ALWAYS risks involved.

I believe this bill LIMITS the already extremely limited choices in childbirth in the state of Hawaii. Home birth is a midwifery model, not a medical model. It shares the belief that pregnancy, birth, and post-partum are natural acts and in many circumstances do not need intervention. There are plenty of consumers seeking an alternative to "routine care", antibiotics, and pharmaceutical management of their ailments *and* their pregnancies. Naturopathic care treats the whole person, not the symptoms. The state of Hawaii recognizes the importance of Naturopathic medicine, licensing physicians to practice. NDs have been attending home births as part of their scope of practice since Chap 455 became law in 1925. If further regulation is needed then it should be combined with ALL the home birth practitioners, not treated as an isolated practice. Please refer to testimony given for SB2569 for my beliefs on home birth in general.

With Aloha
Jaymie Lewis
Apprentice Midwife and Doula

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
To: [HTHTestimony](#)
Cc: lea.tiare@gmail.com
Subject: Submitted testimony for SB2070 on Feb 10, 2014 13:15PM
Date: Sunday, February 09, 2014 10:37:58 AM

SB2070

Submitted on: 2/9/2014

Testimony for HTH on Feb 10, 2014 13:15PM in Conference Room 229

| Submitted By | Organization | Testifier Position | Present at Hearing |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Lea Minton | Individual | Support | No |

Comments: Dear Senator Josh Green and Members of the Committee on Health, I am writing in support of this bill with an amendment. I support this bill as Naturopathic Doctors (NDs) have informed me that this bill essentially is what they are required to do in their training as child birth attendants. That means that this bill is in accordance with their nationally accredited training, for ND's who completed training within the last 10 years. While supporting this bill I do strongly recommend an amendment be made to the effective date. This bill is currently effective upon being signed into law. I believe an amendment should be made to change the effective date to at a minimum January 1, 2015. This would allow for the ND's who currently offer childbirth services to get all of their paperwork in order as well as allow for the ND board to be prepared to accept these documents and issue a revised license. Thank you, Lea Minton, Certified Nurse Midwife

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
To: [HTHTestimony](#)
Cc: dianehawaii@hotmail.com
Subject: Submitted testimony for SB2070 on Feb 10, 2014 13:15PM
Date: Sunday, February 09, 2014 12:59:24 PM

SB2070

Submitted on: 2/9/2014

Testimony for HTH on Feb 10, 2014 13:15PM in Conference Room 229

| Submitted By | Organization | Testifier Position | Present at Hearing |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Diane Parker | Individual | Oppose | No |

Comments: I don't support further certification of NDs doing home births at this time. If further regulation is needed (and we do not believe there is a need) then to do it as one unified act with ALL the home birth practitioners.

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov

Hearing Date 2-10-14 1:15pm Rm 229
RE: SB2070 Relating to Naturopathy
OPPOSITION

Aloha Honorable Chair and Committee members of Health and Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection,

My name is Justine Kamelamela. I am writing in **OPPOSITION** of SB2070. My ND has been my main care provider for almost 14 years and has also been my midwife for both of my sons (3 and 6weeks old). I don't support further certification of NDs doing home births at this time. NDs have been attending home births as part of their scope of practice since Chap 455 became law in 1925. If further regulation is needed, then please do it as one unified act with ALL the home birth practitioners. Home birth is a midwifery model, not a medical model.

Please **OPPOSE** and **KILL SB2070**.

Mahalo for you time,
Justine Kamelamela

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
To: [HTHTestimony](#)
Cc: sunshine.birth@gmail.com
Subject: Submitted testimony for SB2070 on Feb 10, 2014 13:15PM
Date: Sunday, February 09, 2014 11:55:38 AM
Attachments: [SB2070.doc](#)

SB2070

Submitted on: 2/9/2014

Testimony for HTH on Feb 10, 2014 13:15PM in Conference Room 229

| Submitted By | Organization | Testifier Position | Present at Hearing |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| kaela kajiyama | Individual | Oppose | No |

Comments:

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov

TESTIMONY FOR SB2070

SB2070

To: Honorable Chair and Committee members of Health and Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection,

Hearing date 2-10-14 1:15pm rm 229

RE: SB2070 Relating to Naturopathy

I am writing to Oppose bill SB2070. I do not support further certification of Naturopathic Doctorss doing home births at this time. NDs have been attending home births as part of their scope of practice since Chap 455 became law in 1925. If further regulation is needed (and we do not believe there is a need) then to do it as one unified act with ALL the home birth practitioners. Unify, not divide. Home birth is a midwifery model, not a medical model. Please refer to testimony given for SB2569 SD1!

Thank you for taking my evidence and experience into consideration.

Sincerely,

Lucia Lazar

OPPOSITION TO BILL SB2070 RELATING TO NATUROPATHY

To: Honorable Chair and Committee members of Health and Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection

Hearing date 2-10-14 1:15pm rm 229

RE: SB2070 Relating to Naturopathy

Dear Sirs and Madams:

My name is Karen Dizney and I am writing to oppose SB2070. I do not support requiring further certification of Naturopathic Doctors (NDs) to attend homebirths. NDs have been attending homebirths as part of their scope of practice since Chap 455 became law in 1925.

I do not see why they would need further certification to attend a birth as family physicians (MDs) are not required to further certify to attend birth in a hospital. NDs are trained in all aspects of health and are supremely qualified to attend births.

Homebirth is a very distinct midwifery model based on evidence based care. Evidence based care is the model that NDs are taught so it would stand to reason that they would be regulated along with all homebirth practitioners if it were necessary. I do not believe it is necessary to regulate them.

Please do not allow this bill to pass. Naturopaths are already qualified to attend homebirths by the nature of all the schooling they have received. Nothing more should be required.

Thanks for taking the time to read my testimony.

Karen Dizney

To: Honorable Chair and Committee members of Health and Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection,

Hearing date 2-10-14 1:15pm rm 229

RE: SB2070 Relating to Naturopathy (Oppose)

To Whom It May Concern:

I do not support further certification of NDs practicing and supporting home births at this time. NDs have been attending home births as part of their scope of practice since Chap 455 became law in 1925. If further regulation is needed (and we do not believe there is a need) then to do it as one unified act with ALL the home birth practitioners. Unify, not divide. Home birth is a midwifery model, not a medical model. Please refer to testimony given for SB2569 SD1!

Mahalo,

Jennifer Shim

Makiki/Punchbowl

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
To: [HTHTestimony](#)
Cc: aloha979@gmail.com
Subject: Submitted testimony for SB2070 on Feb 10, 2014 13:15PM
Date: Sunday, February 09, 2014 10:49:17 AM

SB2070

Submitted on: 2/9/2014

Testimony for HTH on Feb 10, 2014 13:15PM in Conference Room 229

| Submitted By | Organization | Testifier Position | Present at Hearing |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Kathryn Taketa-Wong | Individual | Comments Only | Yes |

Comments: I am a licensed naturopathic physician, and support the position of the Hawaii Society of Naturopathic Physicians that this bill should be amended to include a grandfathering provision for naturopathic physicians practicing natural childbirth for 10 years or longer. Thank you for the opportunity to testify on this bill.

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
To: [HTHTestimony](#)
Cc: est.asia@yahoo.com
Subject: Submitted testimony for SB2070 on Feb 10, 2014 13:15PM
Date: Saturday, February 08, 2014 11:02:09 PM

SB2070

Submitted on: 2/8/2014

Testimony for HTH on Feb 10, 2014 13:15PM in Conference Room 229

| Submitted By | Organization | Testifier Position | Present at Hearing |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Estasia Barrientosi | Individual | Oppose | Yes |

Comments: 1. To: Honorable Chair and Committee members of Health and Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection, 2. Hearing date 2-10-14 1:15pm rm 229 3. RE: SB2070 Relating to Naturopathy 4. Oppose

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
To: HTHTestimony
Cc: katjabajema@gmail.com
Subject: Submitted testimony for SB2070 on Feb 10, 2014 13:15PM
Date: Saturday, February 08, 2014 8:01:08 PM

SB2070

Submitted on: 2/8/2014

Testimony for HTH on Feb 10, 2014 13:15PM in Conference Room 229

| Submitted By | Organization | Testifier Position | Present at Hearing |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Katja Bajema | Individual | Oppose | No |

Comments: I don't support further certification of NDs doing home births at this time. NDs have been attending home births as part of their scope of practice since Chap 455 became law in 1925. Further regulation is not needed. IF any changes pass it should be done under one act with ALL the home birth practitioners. Unify, not divide. Home birth is a midwifery model, not a medical model. Please refer to testimony given for SB2569 SD1! Aloha and Mahalo, Katja Bajema

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov

REGULAR SESSION OF 2014

To Honorable Chair and Committee Members of Health, and Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection,

Hearing 2-10-14 1:15pm Rm 229_

Please make (12 copies) copies. Mahalo

RE: SB 2070 Relating to Naturopathy - IN OPPOSITION

Good Afternoon,

I am a supporter of home birth.

I oppose SB 2070 for the following reasons.

1. I do not support the further certification of naturopathic doctors attending homebirths at this time.
2. Naturopathic doctors have been attending home births as part of their scope of practice since Chapter 455 became law in 1925.
3. If further regulation of homebirth is needed, then such regulation of homebirth should be created in one specific bill, including all home birth practitioners.
4. Please refer to the testimony given for SB2569 and SB2569 SD1.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Monika Catanzaro

To: Honorable Chair and Committee members of Health and Committee on
Commerce and Consumer Protection,

Hearing date 2-10-14 1:15pm rm 229

RE: SB2070 Relating to Naturopathy

Opposed

I don't support further certification of NDs doing home births at this time. NDs have been attending home births as part of their scope of practice since Chap 455 became law in 1925.

If further regulation is needed (and I do not believe there is a need) then to do it as one unified act with ALL the home birth practitioners. Unify, not divide. Home birth is a midwifery model, not a medical model.

Please refer to testimony given for SB2569

Tara Compehos

My name is Kristie Duarte and I am here to oppose SB2070. I am here to testify that I had a safe, wonderful and unforgettable homebirth with Dr. Lori Kimata. It was such a beautiful experience. I do not believe midwives should need to be certified to be able to practice in Hawaii. They should be able to regulate themselves and govern themselves. They have done a good job and have done so since 1925. Homebirth should not be regulated by the medical community. Women should have the right to choose who is qualified to be their midwife for birthing at home.

Dear Honorable Chair and Committee members of Health and Committee on
Commerce and Consumer Protection,

Hearing Date 2-10-14, 1:15pm, Room 229

RE: SB2070 Relating to Naturopathy

Oppose

I don't support further certification of NDs doing home births at this time. NDs have been attending home births as part of their scope of practice since Chap 455 became law in 1925. If further regulation is needed (and we do not believe there is a need) then to do it as one unified act with ALL the home birth practitioners. Unify, not divide. Home birth is a midwifery model, not a medical model. Please refer to testimony given for SB2569 SD1!

Regards,

Mrs. R

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
To: [HTHTestimony](#)
Cc: 2kahaulea@gmail.com
Subject: Submitted testimony for SB2070 on Feb 10, 2014 13:15PM
Date: Sunday, February 09, 2014 10:18:53 AM

SB2070

Submitted on: 2/9/2014

Testimony for HTH on Feb 10, 2014 13:15PM in Conference Room 229

| Submitted By | Organization | Testifier Position | Present at Hearing |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Kylee Mar | Individual | Oppose | No |

Comments: STRONGLY OPPOSE

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
To: [HTHTestimony](#)
Cc: ngoumbi@hotmail.com
Subject: Submitted testimony for SB2070 on Feb 10, 2014 13:15PM
Date: Friday, February 07, 2014 5:34:23 PM

SB2070

Submitted on: 2/7/2014

Testimony for HTH on Feb 10, 2014 13:15PM in Conference Room 229

| Submitted By | Organization | Testifier Position | Present at Hearing |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| laurence rousel | Individual | Oppose | No |

Comments: Keep state out of home-births. Existing laws are sufficient. Don't waste \$ on a non-issue.

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov

February 9, 2014

Subject: Hearing date: February 10, 2014; 1:30pm; Room 229 for SB2070

Dear Honorable Chair & Committee Members on Health

I am submitting my testimony online opposing SB2070 because I don't support further certification of NDs in order for them to do home births at this time. Home births have been a part of their practice and services provided since Chapter 455 became law in 1925. Home birth is a midwifery model and not a medical model of birth.

Thank you.

Respectfully submitted,
Kristl Woo

To: Honorable Chair and Committee members of Health and Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection,

Hearing date 2-10-14 at 1:15pm Room 229

RE: SB2070 Relating to Naturopathy-IN OPPOSITION

I am a Naturopathic Physician and Licensed Acupuncturist and have been in practice in Honolulu since 1995.

I strongly oppose SB2070 for the following reasons

1. Home birth is safe, as safe if not safer than hospital births. If safety is what the legislators are concerned about, let's study all birth options, home and hospital to discern what is safe? (Rising c-section rates, inductions, medications...safe?) Let's dialogue, If legislators are truly interested in learning about home birth as Green's press release indicates, then take this next year to learn about the differences between the midwifery model vs the medical model of birthing. Become educated.

2. We (the public, the home birth practitioners and community, and the legislators) are all interested in safety and quality care. Unfortunately, this is not what this bill will provide. Instead it restricts the rights of families to deliver their children in the settings they feel true to them and with the attendants they choose. It is not the legislature's right to decide how and where someone can birth.

3. This bill is divisive because some forms of midwifery/home birth practices would be excluded and criminalized in this bill. The home birth community is unifying, and wants to include all practitioners who can then provide support for all the different types of birth experiences the community is asking for.

4. Let the home birth community form their own advisory counsel with all birth practitioners represented - ND, CPM, CNM, Direct Entry, Traditional midwives, OB, Family Practitioners etc to gather data, dialogue and form appropriate standards acceptable to all birth practitioners and the community, and bring this back to the legislature next session.

I request that the committee consider a grandfathering provision for ND's who have been practicing natural childbirth for 10 years or more. Thank you for the opportunity to testify on SB 2070.

Sincerely,

Karen Tan, ND, MAcOM, LAc

REGULAR SESSION OF 2014

For: Honorable Senate Committee Health Chair Green, CPN Chair Baker and Committee members

Hearing date 2-10-14 1:15pm Rm 229

RE: SB 2070 Relating to Naturopathy - IN OPPOSITION

Aloha honorable chair and committee members,

My name is Dr. Lori Kimata, I am a fourth generation Hawaii resident., attended Punahou for 13 years, UCLA for 4 and National College for four years and my medical degree. I have been a licensed naturopathic physician and a midwife now for over twenty four years, and have been assisting mothers in having their babies at home since 1985. I have been the past-president of the Hawaii Society of Naturopathic Physicians and have sat on the board of the American Association of Naturopathic Physicians, our national organization. Chap 455 licensing naturopathic physicians has been existence in Hawaii since 1925.

I strongly oppose SB 2070 for the following reasons.

- Natural Childbirth at home has been a part of Naturopathic Medicine and included in our Hawaii Statute (Chapter 455 created in 1925) for about 90 years. This statute currently contains excellent standards of practice which are continually scrutinized and revised to meet the needs of our time. In addition, there are many other states like ours where natural childbirth is included in the scope of practice of Naturopathic Physicians.
- This bill currently tries to define a scope of practice without an in depth understanding of the various practitioners, roles and responsibilities involved in home birth. The

medical hospital-based model it imposes doesn't take into account the population it is regulating and doesn't accurately represent the different model of home birthing.

- We are currently in the process of defining and self governing the entire practice of home birthing, with varying home birth providers, naturopathic physicians being one of them, all of whom have different levels of training and experience, along with differing cultural and traditional scopes of practice. Having a separate certification for naturopathic doctors seems neither sensible nor financially reasonable.
- We have already begun to form a Home Birth Council that reflects the variety of practices, mothers and advocates. This Council shall be self-defined and self-regulated.
- We request the opportunity to gather data, standards of care, and wise practices to present before the legislature at a later date.

For these reasons and more I oppose SB2070 as it stands.

Sincerely,

Dr. Lori Kimata ND, midwife

To: Honorable Chair and Committee members of Health and
Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection,
Hearing date 2-10-14 1:15pm rm 229
RE: SB2070 Relating to Naturopathy
Oppose

I don't support further certification of NDs doing home births at this time. NDs have been attending home births as part of their scope of practice since Chap 455 became law in 1925. If further regulation is needed (and we do not believe there is a need) then to do it as one unified act with ALL the home birth practitioners. Unify, not divide. Home birth is a midwifery model, not a medical model. Please refer to testimony given for SB2569 SD1!

Thank you,
Love Chance

1. To: Honorable Chair and Committee members of Health and Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection,
2. Hearing date 2-10-14 1:15pm rm 229
3. RE: SB2070 Relating to Naturopathy
4. Oppose

I do not support further certification of NDs doing home births at this time. NDs have been attending home births as part of their scope of practice since Chap 455 became law in 1925. If further regulation is needed (and we do not believe there is a need) then to do it as one unified act with ALL the home birth practitioners. Unify, not divide. Home birth is a midwifery model, not a medical model. Please refer to testimony given for SB2569 SD1!

A) Home birth is safe, as safe if not safer than hospital births. If safety is what the legislators are concerned about, let's study all birth options, home and hospital to discern what is safe? (Rising c-sect rate, inductions, medications...safe?) Let's dialogue, If legislators are truly interested in learning about home birth as Green's press release indicates, then take this next year to learn about the differences between the midwifery model vs the medical model of birthing. Become educated.

B) We (the public, the home birth practitioners and community, and the legislators) are all interested in safety and quality care. Unfortunately, this is not what this bill will provide. Instead it restricts the rights of families to deliver their children in the settings they feel true to them and with the attendants they choose. It is not the legislature's right to decide how and where someone can birth.

C) This bill is divisive because some forms of midwifery/home birth practices would be excluded and criminalized in this bill. The home birth community is unifying, and wants to include all practitioners who can then provide support for all the different types of birth experiences the community is asking for.

D) Let the home birth community form their own advisory counsel with all birth practitioners represented - ND, CPM, CNM, Direct Entry, Traditional midwives, OB, Family Practitioners etc to gather data, dialogue and form appropriate standards acceptable to all birth practitioners and the community, and bring this back to the legislature next session.

From: Katherine E Kauffman
44-282 Mikiola Dr.
Kane'ohe HI 96744

To: Honorable Chair and Committee members of Health and Committee
on Commerce and Consumer Protection

Hearing date: February 10th, 2014; 1:15 pm; Room 229

RE: SB2070 Relating to Naturopathy

Position: I OPPOSE this bill

I am opposed to this bill. I do not, at this time, support requirements for further certification of Naturopathic Doctors attending homebirths. NDs have been attending and assisting at homebirths for decades since Chap 455 became law in 1925. They are highly trained and skilled in doing so. To enact legislation that restricts the ability of NDs to attend homebirths in Hawaii at this time would be a great disservice to women and families in Hawaii who have found this a safe and preferable alternative to medicalized birth in a hospital setting. I include myself in this category. The midwifery model of prenatal, perinatal, and postnatal care has key differences from the medical model. Homebirths attended by NDs are at least as safe as obstetrician-attended hospital births, all else being equal. I have submitted testimony expressing my opposition to SB2569 and SB2569 SD1 Relating to Home Birth; please read and consider that additional testimony as it also pertains to the provision of pregnancy and birth care by Naturopathic Doctors.

To: Honorable Chair and Committee members of Health, and Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection

Hearing date 2-10-14 1:15pm rm 229

Please make 12 copies - Mahalo

RE: SB2070 Relating to Naturopathy– IN OPPOSITION

Good Morning,

I am a supporter of home birth.

I oppose Senate Bill 2070.

I do not support further certification of NDs who practice home birth at this time.

Naturopathic Doctors have been attending home births as part of their scope of practice since 1925 when Chapter 455 became law.

If further regulation of home birth is needed, although the home birth community does not believe there is such a need, then the regulations should be under one bill that includes all home birth practitioners.

Please refer to testimony given for SB2569 and SB2569 D1.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Rocio Bueno

Testimony of Laulani Teale, MPH
in OPPOSITION to SB 2070, Relating to Naturopathy
COMMITTEE ON HEALTH
Senator Josh Green, Chair
Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Vice Chair

2-9-2014

Aloha Kākou,

I am writing today in strong opposition to SB 2070, which creates restrictions on naturopaths attending home births. I feel that these restrictions are unnecessary and undue.

There are only a few naturopaths in Hawai'i who attend births at all. These are brave attendants with decades of experience. This measure would negatively impact the most experienced of those attendants.

As a Hawaiian cultural practitioner, I oppose this measure, which would severely impact the cultural practices facilitated by naturopathic doctors.

As a firsthand witness to this naturopathic skill, as well as many problems in hospital births, I believe this legislation is misdirected. There is no evidence whatsoever that any naturopath in Hawai'i needs more training, regulation or certification. What they need is recognition and support by government and the standard medical establishment for the important work that they are already doing.

If the legislature wishes to make real positive change happen in the future, here is what I suggest:

- Facilitate communication between different styles of practice without threat.
- Mandate hospitals – not naturopaths – to increase respect and flexibility in women's birthing choices in general, and particularly in regard to non-traumatic transfer of care in the event of an emergency transport.
- Recognize and support the excellent, brave, culturally competent, hard work being done by naturopaths and other natural medical practitioners. Build trust by refraining from persecution and blame, as are clearly implied in this measure.

Mahalo nui loa for your time and consideration.

Please contact me at any time.

Me ke aloha 'oia'i'o nō,



Laulani Teale, MPH
(808)256-6637



To: Honorable Chair and Committee members of Health and
Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection,

Hearing date 2-10-14 1:15pm rm 229

RE: SB2070 Relating to Naturopathy

Oppose

I have been a patient of an ND and ND midwife most of my life. I do not support further certification of NDs doing home births at this time. I have submitted testimony for SB2569 SD1 and oppose this as well.

Thank you,
Sara DiGrazia

Abigail Schoder

REGULAR SESSION OF 2014

For: Honorable chair and Committee members of Health and committee on commerce and consumer protection

Hearing: February 10, 2014 1:15 p.m.(date) Rm 229

RE: SB 2070 Relating to Natropathy – IN OPPOSITION

Aloha,

My name is Abigail Schoder. I don't support further certification of NDs doing home births at this time. Nds have been attending births as a part of the scope of their practice since chapter 455 became law in 1925. If further regulation is needed (and we do not believe that it is needed) then to do it as one unified act with all the home birth practitioners. Unify, not divide. Homebirth is a midwifery model, not a medical model. Please refer to testimony given for SB 2569 and Sb2569 Sd1.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Aloha, Abigail Schoder

Abigail Schoder

REGULAR SESSION OF 2014

For: Honorable Senate Committee Health Chair Green, Vice Chair Baker and Committee Members, Honorable Chair and Committee members of Health, Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection and Judiciary and Labor

Hearing: February 10, 2014 1:30 p.m.(date) Rm 229

RE: SB 2569 and SB2569 SD1 Relating to Home Birth – IN OPPOSITION

Aloha,

My name is Abigail Schoder. I had a home birth on the island of Kauai, am a registered voter in the state of Hawaii and am a long time supporter of a woman's right to birth in a way that feels safe to her, whether that be a home birth or at a hospital. Personally for me that choice was a home birth.

I know women who choose to birth at home and other women who choose to birth in a hospital. I support them all to make the choice that feels best and most safe for them individually. I am not opposed to hospital-based births if it is what the woman feels more comfortable with. I would not and do not expect that I should have the right to tell her where she has to birth. It wouldn't be fair that she be legally bound to HAVE to have a home birth if she felt safer in the hospital. I expect the same freedom of choice in being able to choose to birth at home. This choice is in fact both the mother (and the father) and the child's BIRTH RIGHT, literally. We use the term "birthright" in our language to represent different things. This freedom of choice (where and how a woman births)is fundamentally at the core of the definition of "Birth right".

My labor and childbirth was a wonderful and challenging experience for me. There were moments of it that presented challenges. My midwives were fully competent, experienced and prepared in how to handle the situation to support both my baby and myself in having a safe delivery. They watched for signs and signals that they needed to be aware of and competently took action in a timely manner to ensure safety for both my baby and I.

Part of why I trusted my midwives is because I did my "homework" and checked out their backgrounds, experience etc. to make sure I was making a wise choice in who I would be working with in this very important process of birthing life. It is unfortunate that some people may call themselves a "midwife" and they don't have integrity to back that up. All midwives are not created equal and it is the responsibility of the client to do her research, homework, interviews etc. to make her own informed and competent decision.

This bill does not offer a woman support in making this decision. I strongly feel that it would cripple many highly skilled midwives from doing their job, not to mention rob women the right to experience the highly supportive and

empowering experience of birthing in a way that is right for her and her baby. Birthing is a full fledged initiation for a woman and her child, one that deserves to be honored and supported not interfered and controlled.

I strongly oppose SB 2569 for the following reasons.

1. On its face, this bill is inaccurate. It cites a flawed study, and it suggests home birth is dangerous and unsafe. I join other home birth practitioners, mothers and advocates to correct that notion. We realize that we have a responsibility to provide data and information about our home birth practices, our training, and our experiences to the legislature and community-at-large.

2. This bill currently tries to define a scope of practice without an in depth understanding of the various practitioners, roles and responsibilities involved in home birth. The medical hospital-based model it imposes doesn't take into account the population it is regulating and doesn't accurately represent different models of home birthing, each with unique traditions, scopes of practice, varying types of practitioners and their educational backgrounds, safety protocols and standards of care that are already in place.

3. The Home Birth Safety Board is also based on a medical model, and it does not reflect the culture and practice of home birth. It doesn't even reflect the participants of home birth

practice. This bill assumes there is no oversight over home birth; in fact, midwives have the capacity to govern themselves.

4. As written, this bill would essentially eliminate the option of finding a legal home birth attendant. It is the rite/right of every birthing mother to choose where,

Abigail Schoder

REGULAR SESSION OF 2014

For: Honorable Senate Committee Health Chair Green, Vice Chair Baker and Committee Members, Honorable Chair and Committee members of Health, Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection and Judiciary and Labor

Hearing: February 10, 2014 1:30 p.m.(date) Rm 229

RE: SB 2569 and SB2569 SD1 Relating to Home Birth – IN OPPOSITION

Aloha,

My name is Abigail Schoder. I had a home birth on the island of Kauai, am a registered voter in the state of Hawaii and am a long time supporter of a woman's right to birth in a way that feels safe to her, whether that be a home birth or at a hospital. Personally for me that choice was a home birth.

I know women who choose to birth at home and other women who choose to birth in a hospital. I support them all to make the choice that feels best and most safe for them individually. I am not opposed to hospital-based births if it is what the woman feels more comfortable with. I would not and do not expect that I should have the right to tell her where she has to birth. It wouldn't be fair that she be legally bound to HAVE to have a home birth if she felt safer in the hospital. I expect the same freedom of choice in being able to choose to birth at home. This choice is in fact both the mother (and the father) and the child's BIRTH RIGHT, literally. We use the term "birthright" in our language to represent different things. This freedom of choice (where and how a woman births) is fundamentally at the core of the definition of "Birth right".

My labor and childbirth was a wonderful and challenging experience for me. There were moments of it that presented challenges. My midwives were fully competent, experienced and prepared in how to handle the situation to support both my baby and myself in having a safe delivery. They watched for signs and signals that they needed to be aware of and competently took action in a timely manner to ensure safety for both my baby and I.

Part of why I trusted my midwives is because I did my "homework" and checked out their backgrounds, experience etc. to make sure I was making a wise choice in who I would be working with in this very important process of birthing life. It is unfortunate that some people may call themselves a "midwife" and they don't have integrity to back that up. All midwives are not created equal and it is the responsibility of the client to do her research, homework, interviews etc. to make her own informed and competent decision.

This bill does not offer a woman support in making this decision. I strongly feel that it would cripple many highly skilled midwives from doing their job, not to mention rob women the right to experience the highly supportive and empowering experience of birthing in a way that is right for her and her baby. Birthing is a full fledged initiation for a woman and her child, one that deserves to be honored and supported not interfered

and controlled.

I strongly oppose SB 2569 for the following reasons.

1. On its face, this bill is inaccurate. It cites a flawed study, and it suggests home birth is dangerous and unsafe. I join other home birth practitioners, mothers and advocates to correct that notion. We realize that we have a responsibility to provide data and information about our home birth practices, our training, and our experiences to the legislature and community-at-large.
2. This bill currently tries to define a scope of practice without an in depth understanding of the various practitioners, roles and responsibilities involved in home birth. The medical hospital-based model it imposes doesn't take into account the population it is regulating and doesn't accurately represent different models of home birthing, each with unique traditions, scopes of practice, varying types of practitioners and their educational backgrounds, safety protocols and standards of care that are already in place.
3. The Home Birth Safety Board is also based on a medical model, and it does not reflect the culture and practice of home birth. It doesn't even reflect the participants of home birth practice. This bill assumes there is no oversight over home birth; in fact, midwives have

IN OPPOSITION TO SB2070, Relating to Naturopathy

Regular Session of 2014

Hearing on Monday, February 10, 2014 at 1:15 p.m. in Room 229

For: Honorable Chair and Vice Chair and members of Health Committee and Commerce and Consumer Protection Committee

Dear Sirs and Madams,

My name is Suzanna Kinsey and I am a registered voter and a home birth mother to three wonderful children. I strongly oppose SB2070.

I don't support further certification of Naturopathic Doctors doing home births at this time. NDs have been attending home births as part of their scope of practice since Chap 455 became law in 1925. If further regulation is needed (and we do not believe there is a need) then to do it as one unified act with ALL the home birth practitioners. Unify, not divide. Home birth is a midwifery model, not a medical model. Please refer to my testimony given against SB2569 and SB2569 SD1!

Thank you for your time and effort in this matter.

Yours truly,

Suzanna Kinsey