

Nancy Silva
111 8th ave
Santa Cruz, Ca
95062

February 18, 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care. There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially. One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, not when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more. SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,

Nancy Silva

Nancy Winston
120 Wahikuli Rd.
Lahaina, HI 96761

February , 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other-Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,
Nancy Winston

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, not when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the

requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,

--

Jennifer Pilon

Naturopathic Medicine Candidate 2016

Bastyr University

jennifer.pilon@bastyr.edu

To the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection

Please oppose SB2577 SD1

It will limit my freedom to make educated choices and have the resources available to me.

My profession was a RN with a BS degree from University of Colorado and I can't work now.

I am a part Hawaiian, retired military wife, who nearly died from "septic [infection] shock" in 2011.

My good and bad bacteria and fungus were annihilated from my medical treatment in the hospital so I came home and agreed to the natural path to get my life back.

Trying to get my good fauna growing again so I could digest what I do eat and I stop losing weight [over 100 lbs – 35 of them during my 22 day stay in the hospital] "STARVING TO A SLOW DEATH" with malnutrition.

My Drs. are working in harmony with each other and especially with me. I am slowly getting better. I may never be fully functional but I am on the path not stuck bedbound or fully house bound.

I strongly oppose you taking away my health and freedom to choose this path to live the remainder of my life and the lives of my family who are getting helped by our choice of Drs. MD & ND.

The rules are in place already for me to make this choice enforce them so "the bad eggs" can be eliminated not all ND's.

This is a matter of life or death; happiness or depression and functional or vegetable in my case.

My family has need [autism, Asperger, PTSD from serving our country, paraplegic, depression, etc.] of MD'S AND ND'S and we don't want our choices limited by unnecessary legislation. The rules are already in place; enforce them.

Don't open another "Pandora's box" of law suits, losing good ND's and putting unnecessary burden on the MD and ND practitioners.

Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the best MD AND ND care I am getting and deserve.

MAHALO

Nina Gay Yoshida

February 18, 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SDI Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SDI. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SDI, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. **The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SDI have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights.** Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, not when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SDI would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SDI would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SDI and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,
Heather Schiffke

Terri Alexander
4348 Waialae Ave #408
Honolulu, Hi 96816

February 18, 2014

Position of Testimony: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

The hearing for this measure is at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I hope that you will do everything you can to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would require naturopathic physicians to reduce or give up prescription rights that are necessary to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the inappropriate restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefited greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of

naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, not when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,

Terri Alexander

Kelly A. Loring
1767 Green Meadows Dr
Piedmont, SD 57769

February 18, 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefited greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. My education far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect access to the high level of naturopathic care that everyone deserves.

Thank you,
Kelly A. Loring, ND, MPH, CPH

I am strongly opposed to this Bill. I don't currently reside in Hawaii but my mother and siblings utilize Holistic medicine and it has significantly improved their health and quality of life. The absurdity of the proponents of this Bill and their continued efforts to restrict and oversee holistic medicine is counter productive. Please stop this nonsense once and for all. Keep Hawaii moving forward in the care of its citizens health and their wellbeing.

Sincerely,

Greg Moreau

24 Village Gate Way

Nyack NY, 10960

February 18, 2014

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I write to oppose S.B. 2577.

I use a naturopathic physician in Honolulu on a regular basis. She has given me extraordinary relief from a very large number of allergies with which I had been painfully afflicted for decades. Not one of the many regular M.D.s I had consulted over those decades for my many allergies had actually relieved any of my allergies. Instead, all simply wanted to reduce the symptoms through the permanent use of a variety of drugs—all of which had various unpleasant side-effects. Conventional medicine's approach to my allergies was a dead-end. In my experience, M.D.s are inducted into a conventional and constricted view of health through the standard and constricted education they receive in medical school. At least with respect to the diagnosis and treatment of allergies, they appear to be relentlessly closed-minded and conventional.

I mention this because the changes to the regulation of naturopaths in Hawaii proposed in S.B. 2577 put naturopaths under the direct supervision and control of an M.D. The reason I turned to a naturopath to begin with was because M.D.s practicing in the area of allergies diagnosed me and treated me from within an utterly blinkered and conventional mentality—a mentality that, in addition, was completely ineffectual.

I am appalled by the idea that an M.D. will be looking over the shoulder of my naturopath with the implicit threat that she will be reported to the board if, in the M.D.'s untrammelled discretion, the M.D. has "any concerns" whatever "with naturopathic formulary and amounts prescribed." Section 455-A(2)(b). The reason I go to a naturopath for allergy treatment is that I do not want to be suffer the consequences of the blinkered mentality of conventional medicine.

The "collegial relationship" language set forth in section 455-A(2)(b) is no doubt meant to encourage a softer impression, but a close reading of the provision reveals otherwise. There are two problems with the structure that the bill sets up.

First, the definition of the term "collegial relationship" attempts to imply a soft-focus and collaborative approach to the M.D.'s supervision and control. Section 455-A(2)(b) ("collegial relationship' means a professional relationship intended to foster cooperation and collaboration in integrative care.") But very few M.D.s have any perspective on "integrative care" as practiced by naturopaths. The bill's language puts someone effectively in charge of naturopathic prescriptions who has no context, no notion, no training, concerning the practice of naturopathic medicine—someone who may well, in fact, harbor a professional animosity toward a sector of health care many M.D.s consider quasi-illegitimate to begin with.

Second, the soft language in the definition of 'collegial relationship' conceals a hard fact. Whether the legally-mandated supervisory relationship is "cooperative" or "collaborative"

or, indeed, has any bearing on “integrative care” at all, is simply not enforceable under the language of the bill. It is, in effect, legally irrelevant aspirational fluff.

What is enforceable, in contrast, is the language under which the M.D. “**shall** ... Perform a quarterly review of the list of naturopathic formulary items that have been prescribed by the naturopathic physician” and **shall** “Address any concerns with naturopathic formulary and amounts prescribed with the prescribing naturopathic physician **and** the board.” Section 455-A(2)(a)-(b)(emphases added).

This creates (a) an onerous regulatory duty on the part of the naturopath to report to the supervising M.D. virtually every prescription, and the amount prescribed, and (b) a legal duty on the part of the supervising M.D. to report to the board any concerns (without any qualification as to their significance, the basis for the concern, etc.) regarding the medication to the board. This loosely drafted language burdens the supervising M.D. with a legal duty to report even the slightest or vaguest concern to the board. Moreover, (c) the naturopath must submit a comprehensive and detailed monthly report to the board. Section 455-B. In addition, (d) the legally-mandated “professional relationship” will not be free. The naturopath will have to hire an expensive M.D. to perform the quarterly review, directly increasing my costs as a client or consumer of naturopathic medicine.

I could understand this flawed and ill-considered regulatory effort better if it were somehow data-driven—if there were numerous reported instances of abuse of the prescriptive authority currently given to practitioners of naturopathic medicine. But I am aware of none. The only effect will be to restrict the ability of naturopaths to provide the kind of alternative medicine that deeply benefits their particular clientele, even while it imposes bureaucratic burdens and administrative costs without any demonstrable benefit. I fear that this bill appears to me to be no more than the conventional medical monopoly’s attempt to restrict competition and to require naturopaths to pay them to look menacingly over their shoulders.

I urge you to oppose Senate Bill 2577.

Pat Brown

Jacob Hwang, 95-1025 Kelakela St. Mililani, HI

February 18 , 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. I am currently a second year naturopathic medical student at Bastyr University in Washington and we are trained in the use of prescription drugs. I feel that my education is competent for the knowledge and use of prescription drugs. We see this evident in the legislature granting prescriptive authority in the state of Washington. As a local boy from Mililani, I would like the legal landscape to be favorable for my profession because I would love to go back to the islands to practice and provide healthcare.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD

in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, not when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,
Jacob Hwang
Doctor of Naturopathic Medicine Candidate
Bastyr University, Class of 2016
jacob.hwang@bastyr.edu

Dear Sir/Madam,

I have been a patient of a naturopathic physician for over 23 years here in Hilo, also using a regular MD to maintain my health at 62.

I understand that this bill severely cuts back the toolkit of the ND so they won't be able to treat their patients effectively. We pay ourselves for these services and it is OUR choice to use ND's to help us stay fit. And that brings me to asking you the following:

My question is: What is it to you to cut back these services? Why are you curtailing my decision to extend my medical services beyond the one provided by my health care provider HMSA here in Hawaii?

I would appreciate an answer to my question, and/or seriously consider NOT accepting this Bill.

Thank you for your time and consideration!

Aloha,
Gerdine Markus

Aubrey Harding
aubreylharding@gmail.com

February 18, 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other-Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, **there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the Naturopathic Board.** There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefited greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii Naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of naturopathic physicians far exceeds that of any MD in many areas essential to my healthcare. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,

Aubrey Harding
Naturopathic Medical Student

Krystal Plonski
3306 E Terrace Street
Seattle, WA 98122

February 18, 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you strongly oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement

that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,

Krystal S. Plonski

--

Krystal S. Plonski
Doctor of Naturopathic Medicine/Masters of Acupuncture and Oriental Medicine Candidate
2014
Homeopathic Academy of Naturopathic Physicians Student Representative
Bastyr University
14500 Juanita Drive NE
Kenmore, WA 98028

Melanie DesChatelets

February 18, 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a licensed physician and should be allotted the rights of delivering care according to the guidelines of licensure.

Thank you for hearing and honoring my testimony,

Sincerely,

Melanie DesChatelets

Melanie DesChatelets, BSc(h), ND
Naturopathic Physician
Board Certified in Acupuncture
Board Certified Prescription Authority

Office Ph: 604.200.7856

www.drdeschat.com

[Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#)

Author of The Minimalist Guide To Supplements



Lawrence G. Fournier
1021 La Jolla Rancho Road
La Jolla CA 92037

February 18, 2014

Position of Testimony: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I hope that you will do everything you can to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would require naturopathic physicians to reduce or give up prescription rights that are necessary to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the inappropriate restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefited greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not

at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, not when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,

Larry Fournier

Alicia Bigelow, ND

1716 SE 22nd Ave

Portland, OR 97214

February 18, 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other-Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even

taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,

Alicia Bigelow, ND

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.


There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,



Karen Tan, ND, MAcOM, LAc

320 Ward Ave, Suite 105

Honolulu, HI 96814

(808) 591-8778

February 18, 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other-Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

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

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to our services. My ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect the high level of naturopathic care that I practice.

Thank you,

Karen Tan, ND, MAcOM, LAc

To Whom this may concern. I have been under the care of Naturopathic Physicians all of my 65 years. I am in good health and I consider this because of the advice and medications prescribed for me when I had any health challenges.

My current Naturopathic Doctor has worked closely with my PHP for Quest and now Medicaid.....and this collaboration has resulted in my successfully dealing with several health challenges.

There is no logical reason for Dr. Marsh, my ND, to be need to be sanctioned by an AMA MD. she is perfectly capable....and it would be an aggravation and unnecessary expense to insist that she do so.

Who is behind this useless legislation? I will be sure to campaign against you in the next election.

Prema Dasara

Kula, Hawaii 96790

Regarding SB2577SD1

- **At issue:**
 - What is the motivation for such onerous legislation?
 - There have been no cases of harm, mismanagement, or prescribing impropriety against an ND's care brought to the Board since we gained prescriptive authority on January 10, 2010. (In fact, no Board action has been brought against a practicing ND in the last 30 years, since our longest practicing NDs have been in Hawaii)

- There is no precedent for such regressive legislation in any other state where NDs have prescriptive authority.
- Misguided approach to force NDs into a subordinate role and to limit their scope of practice, while burdening MDs and the Board, and with NDs playing an increasingly important role (dating back to 1927), with the increasing need for more well-educated, well-trained, well-equipped primary care docs in Hawaii to fill the void.
- Even with comprehensive and comparable educational standards as independent primary care providers, NDs throughout the Islands, cooperate, consult and maintain positive relationships with other health professionals and MDs when it is in the best interest of the patient.
- **Pharmacology Knowledge**
 - NDs have comparable hours of pharmacology courses to other medical prescribing professionals. (# ?)
 - 1994 Legislative audit resulted in discontinuing CE. Most NDs attend continuing ed courses on their own, that include pharmacology.
 - HSNP proposes, 15 CE biennially. (Adequate and sufficient! Under the organization of the local HSNP, approval by national AANP and reviewed by ND Board)
- **Pharmacology Application**
 - 2010 Board members, Drs. Traub and Kern, met with pharmacy board in a cooperative effort to answer questions regarding ND prescribing patterns and to present a unified paper that would be distributed to all pharmacists.
 - Prescribing patterns, specifically as it related to **medical specialty medication**, was used in our formulary primarily in supporting and transitioning patients eventually wanting to be weaned from medication to other effective forms of health care. We also informed members that there are specialty practices within naturopathic medicine but that the former rationale was primarily true.
- **Naturopathic Formulary should remain as it is, with the Board retaining the authority to add or delete any items on the formulary as experience demands.**
 - Board has adopted **Standards of Practice and Care** that set higher standards for NDs, for competence and safety, than any other state in the country.
 - 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 (already) 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.

Tevna Tayler, NMD
PO Box 68255
Oro Valley, AZ 85737

February 18, 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

(Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014, in Conference Room 229)

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair,
and other

Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights or operate under review of an MD doctor, all of which would seriously compromise effective patient care.

As a prescribing naturopathic physician in Arizona who plans to move to Hawaii in a few years and who has just spend the past year working in an Internal Medicine office with an MD and a DO, I can tell you from personal experience that this bill is likely to do serious harm to patient access to good care.

My experience with prescribing compared to that of my MD and DO colleagues is that I, like most other naturopathic doctors of my acquaintance, prescribe as minimally as possible, only after careful research, only when a safer alternative is not available, and only then with great attention to the patient's reactions. My MD and DO colleagues, on the other hand, seem to do minimal research on the medications that they are prescribing, pay little attention to even severe side effects, take the advice of non-physician sales people on how, what, and when to prescribe, and have very little education on safer alternatives. As a result, my patients took less and less medications over time and grew healthier and healthier while the patients seen by the MD and DO took increasing volumes of medications over time and developed additional health problems that needed more medications.

If anyone should be supervising prescribing, in my opinion, based on my experience, therefore, the ND physicians should be supervising the MD and DO physicians, and not the other way around, and prescribing, in general, should only be permitted when no safer and actually healing alternatives are available. While I agree that not all MD and DO physicians fail to do research and use safer alternatives, and not all ND physicians take more care, to assume that ANY MD should supervise ANY ND in prescribing just has no basis in reason, logic, or experience.

The reason that ND physicians exist at all is exactly because the MD and DO physicians do not know and do everything that is required to create and maintain health, and more and more people are actively seeking real solutions to their health problems instead of continuing to be shackled to a broken medical system full of poisonous medications that don't cure, or often even treat, the underlying causes of most health problems. To subjugate ND physicians to physicians of lesser training in many areas of real cure, including the judicious use of pharmaceutical medications, on occasion, would just turn back the clock on medical progress and frustrate the efforts of patients seeking good care. A vote in favor of this bill is a vote in favor of blocking good access to safe and effective medical care.

Please vote to maintain the freedom of choice and access to good medical care from ND physicians that residents of Hawaii currently enjoy. Oppose SB2577 SDI and welcome in the brighter future of healthcare.

Thank you,

Tevna

Tevna Tayler, NMD
drtayler@whhas.com
520-312-4220 (Cell)

Tammy Lum
2353 Aina Lani way
Honolulu, HI 96822
February 18, 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians fully prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care are already in place that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have earned prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it

appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and parenteral therapy, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I demand.

Thank you,

Sent from my iPhone

Janet Crews/ 1032 S. Kihei Rd. A522/ Kihei, Hi. 96753

February 18, 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians
Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no justifiable reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

A naturopathic physician is a licensed physician and should be allotted the rights of delivering care according to the guidelines of licensure. This bill has the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. I have personally chosen to go to my naturopathic physician; just as I have personally chosen my M.D. physician. I am strongly opposed to having politicians decide what kind of services that my doctor can provide; which this bill does.

I strongly oppose SB2577 SD1

Thank you for hearing and honoring my testimony,

Sincerely,

Janet Crews

Heather Korotie, Captain Cook

February 18 , 2014

Position: Strongest Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians – will need to leave Hawaii for healthcare if this is passed

Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

This bill is extremely personal for me and my family. Without full access to Naturopathic Medicine, we will leave Hawaii. While we also have an MD, Naturopathic Medicine is our primary form of care. I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

I have been struggling with an autoimmune disease, Hashimotos that has severely impacted my quality of life leaving me exhausted, with poor concentration, memory impairment, weight gain and depression. My MD in Hawaii has told me this is a "non-diagnosis" because he doesn't know how to treat it. My Naturopath, Dr. Margret Dexter has given me consistent care that continues to evolve as my condition changes. My treatment plan has involved IV therapy, diet and lifestyle changes, herbal medicine, hormone therapy and 3 compounded drugs prescriptions that have been critical in my recovery. When I asked my MD about the compounded prescriptions, he refused to prescribe compounded drugs and would rather put me on anti-depressants. My point in this is that a Naturopath's ability to write prescriptions has been critical for my recovery and it is my Naturopath that I go to for my primary care as my MD. Without this care available, I will need to leave Hawaii for my medical care.

My Naturopath has also prescribed my 2 year old a homeopathic remedy for night terrors and extreme tantrums which has made significant improvements in this scary and disturbing situation. Without this care, we would be waking up multiple times per night with uncontrollable fits which disrupt the sleep of our family and are extremely disturbing.

Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

SB2577 SD1 requires your Naturopathic Physician to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, not when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If SB2577 SD1 is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians.

Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,

Heather Korotie

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, not when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians

are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Nadya Rubinstein

To the Honorable Senator Chair Rosalyn H. Baker, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I oppose SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians. At the Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229, I hope you stand with me to oppose these regulations on naturopathic physicians. Please **do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1**. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

SB2577 SD1 requires your Naturopathic Physician to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be

independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If SB2577 SD1 is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians.

Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,

Marya Mann, Ph.D.
Kailua-Kona, HI
www.maryamann.com

Pratibha Eastwood
P.O.Box 61537
Honolulu, HI 96839
February 18, 2014

Position of Testimony: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to
Naturopathic
Physicians

The hearing for this measure is at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in
Conference
Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian
T.
Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce
and
Consumer Protection:

I hope that you will do everything you can to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill
would
require naturopathic physicians to reduce or give up prescription rights
that
are necessary to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write
certain prescriptions when I need them, without the inappropriate
restrictions
proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since
the
Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive
authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of
patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the
naturopathic
Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of
naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of
practice,
and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefited
greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic
physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and
they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide,
to
the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined.
Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide
oversight
and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The
restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states
where
naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii
naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the
practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's
naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily
recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in
pharmacology
biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that

naturopathic

physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns

they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board.

This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not

at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because

their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician

far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care.

Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult

with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, not when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals

untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to

oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and

Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and

the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic

formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also

reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are

already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the

prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1

and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,
Pratibha Eastwood

Stephen Chun
94-618 Lumiaina St
M101
Waipahu, HI 96797

Feb. 18, 2014

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians fully prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care are already in place that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have earned prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, *not* when

required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and parenteral therapy, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I demand.

Thank you,

Stephen Chun

Valerie Wayne, Ph.D.
927 Prospect St. #303
Honolulu, HI 96822

February 18, 2014

Position of Testimony: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1
Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

The hearing for this measure is at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To The Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair,
The Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair,
and other Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I hope that you will do everything you can to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would require naturopathic physicians to reduce or give up prescription rights that are necessary to their services. The ability of naturopathic doctor, Laurie Steelsmith, to write certain prescriptions when I need them -- without the inappropriate restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1 -- is an important part of my health care. I have been a patient of Dr. Steelsmith's for nearly twenty years, and I have received more excellent and specialized care from her than from any other doctor in the islands. In my opinion, her training amply qualifies her to write the prescriptions I need.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefited greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined.

Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board.

This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to perform adequate reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care.

Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, not when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

I appreciate your giving serious consideration to this request.

Yours sincerely,

Valerie Wayne, Professor Emerita of English University of Hawai'i at Mano

**PRESENTATION OF THE
BOARD OF NATUROPATHIC MEDICINE**

**TO THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON
COMMERCE AND CONSUMER PROTECTION**

**TWENTY-SEVENTH LEGISLATURE
Regular Session of 2014**

Thursday, February 20, 2014
10:30 a.m.

WRITTEN COMMENTS ONLY

**COMMENTS ON SENATE BILL NO. 2577, S.D. 1, RELATING TO NATUROPATHIC
PHYSICIANS.**

**TO THE HONORABLE ROSALYN H. BAKER, 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 provide written comments on Senate Bill. No. 2577, S.D. 1, relating to Naturopathic Physicians. This bill proposes to require naturopathic physicians to qualify for prescription privileges by completing fifteen hours of pharmacology continuing medical education annually and maintaining a collegial relationship with a medical doctor; reduces the naturopathic formulary to seven categories; requires naturopathic physicians to report the type and number of prescriptions they write each month and requires the Board to provide a report of this data to the legislature annually.

The Board strongly opposes this bill with the exception of a requirement for continuing medical education.

First, the Board believes that all naturopathic physicians are qualified to prescribe from the naturopathic formulary without a collegial relationship with a medical doctor.

Although naturopathic physicians prefer to choose natural therapies, they are also trained to use pharmaceutical drugs when it is in the best interest of the patient. Naturopathic physicians are educated and trained to prescribe legend drugs and are knowledgeable about legend drugs that are consistent with the practice of naturopathic medicine. Naturopathic medical students encounter patients already on legend drugs during their clinical education. Determining the appropriateness of the drugs and prescribing them when needed, is an integral part of their didactic education and clinical training¹.

Second, the Board believes that the naturopathic formulary should be left intact. The Board developed the naturopathic formulary in concert with other states that have a long history of naturopathic physician prescribing rights and a good safety record. Additionally, states that have had the longest history of prescriptive rights have independent prescribing authority. Naturopathic physicians in Hawaii have been prescribing pursuant to the naturopathic formulary, which includes legend drugs, since January 1, 2010. To date, the Board is not aware of any complaints pertaining to patient harm due to prescribing from the naturopathic formulary.

Third, the Board supports the intent of continuing education ("CE") because it recognizes the value of CE; however, the Board is also aware of the 1987 Legislative Auditor's Sunset Report in which the auditor found that there is no demonstrated relationship between continuing education requirements and maintaining competency.

¹ See the Association of Accredited Naturopathic Medical Colleges (AANMC) Statement on "Naturopathic Training and the Prescription of Legend Drugs"

CE requirements for naturopathic physicians were repealed based upon the auditor's findings.

Thus, the Board took great care and consideration to provide for consumer safety when it established its standards of practice, care, and ethics², which include requirements for naturopathic physicians to: maintain proficiency and competence, and be diligent in the provision and administration of patient care; 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; inform patients of their right to informed consent and freedom of choice in health care and present patients with all the options for medical care in an unbiased manner; and encourage patient participation in their own health care as it is recognized that such participation leads to better compliance and a faster recovery.

Should the Committee retain the requirement for continuing medical education in pharmacology, the Board respectfully requests that the requirement be amended to fifteen hours of CE per biennium.

Lastly, the Board believes that the requirement for naturopathic physicians to report the types and number of each prescription to the Board each month, as well as the required annual report of this data to the legislature is unnecessary. There has been no justification provided for this reporting requirement and the Board does not have the resources available to support such data collection.

² See Hawaii Administrative Rules Chapter 16-88, Subchapter 11, Standards of Practice, Care, and Ethics

Comments on Senate Bill No. 2577, S.D. 1
Thursday, February 20, 2014
Page 4

Thank you for the opportunity to provide written comments on Senate Bill
No. 2577, S.D. 1.

Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would restrict my naturopathic physician from being able to write prescriptions that are important in the health care of my family. Although naturopathic physicians try to minimize the use of prescription medications, in many cases they are essential to the practice of integrative family medicine.

There is no rational basis for this legislation. Since the Legislature authorized prescriptive rights for Hawaii's naturopathic physicians, there have been:

- No complaints brought to the Hawaii State Naturopathic Board regarding prescriptive use by naturopathic physicians
- No cases of naturopathic physicians using prescriptions outside their training and scope of practice
- No overuse of prescriptive authority by naturopathic physicians
- No lawsuits filed in this regard

Instead, the vast majority of the testimony already submitted regarding SB2577 shows that the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, not when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to

oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,
Thomas Dalbert

February 18, 2014

My Position: Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

To Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I go to a regular M.D. doctor and also to a naturopathic doctor. I believe in both conventional and alternative medicine. I have been going to my naturopathic doctor for over 20 years and am pleased that I have this choice to seek treatment for conditions which I feel alternative medicine would be better than conventional medicine. This bill SB2577 would greatly hinder those of us who want this option. I would think the Hawaii legislature and medical profession would look favorably in having lower medical costs and healthier individuals, instead of hindering them.

1. Despite overwhelming opposition to the bill, why is a second hearing scheduled?
2. Why are Sakoda Construction and other individuals in support of the bill?
3. Who introduced this bill and for what reason?

I'm writing to voice very strong objections to SB2577 SD1. The Legislature received well over 300 emails opposing SB2577, and only three in support, yet the Committee Report (SB2577 SD1 SSCR2244) seemed to ignore this, stating only that the committee "received testimony in opposition to this measure from Sakoda Construction, LLC, and several individuals." Why was a second hearing scheduled when there was such overwhelming opposition to this bill? SB2577 SD1 would require naturopathic physicians to unreasonably reduce their current prescription rights - integral to their services - and add unfair burdens to their practices. This bill is illogical, unnecessary, and clearly biased against the naturopathic profession. It seems intended to foster conflict rather than cooperation in Hawaii's integrative health care community, and it's based on faulty assumptions about the education of naturopathic physicians. For example, the Committee Report incorrectly states that the education of naturopathic physicians "offers very few contact hours of study on pharmacological treatment of disease." In fact, the hours of pharmacology training for naturopathic physicians are nearly the same as that of MDs, and greater than that of osteopaths.

There are so many problems with this bill that adequately describing them all would require dozens of pages of testimony. The following is a brief summary, beginning with its most egregious flaws. First, this bill essentially proposes that naturopathic physicians, in order to continue qualifying for the prescription privileges the legislature wisely granted them (with overwhelming public support) years ago, would be required to have MDs "review" all of their prescriptions. According to the bill, these MDs would then "address any concerns" with these prescriptions, including the actual amounts prescribed, to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is worse than illogical, because:

1. The training of MDs does not at all qualify them for such a role. Allopathic education, compared to naturopathic education, has far fewer standards and requirements for training in the use of natural and preventive treatment modalities. SB2577 SD1 reflects a misunderstanding of, or a disregard for, what a naturopathic physician is. The entire point of naturopathic physician's

education and training is to become a distinctly different type of medical expert than an MD - one who is highly educated in an alternative system of medicine that differs in many ways from that of conventional allopathic physicians. MDs are not equipped by their training to provide a meaningful review of naturopathic prescriptions, or have a comprehensive understanding of the complex issues they involve. (In an attempt to defend the bill, the Committee Report states that “naturopathic education differs from that received within allopathic or osteopathic medical schools.” You cannot have it both ways; if the training is different, then it makes no sense for MDs to review naturopathic prescriptions.)

2. The extensive medical training of naturopathic physicians already more than qualifies them for their current prescription privileges.

3. Such a proposal is conspicuously one-sided and unfair. Is a corresponding requirement placed on MDs and other health care providers? Should MDs be required to have naturopathic physicians review and monitor all of their prescription activities, since the training of naturopathic physicians is much more extensive in many important areas (particularly those pertaining to a broad range of natural and preventive treatments) than that of MDs?

4. Appointing one type of physician to “oversee” another’s jurisdiction raises all manner of legal and ethical concerns. It would be terrible public policy to require one kind of doctor to answer to another kind of doctor, trained in a different form of medicine, in order to simply maintain the prescription rights they were trained to have, especially when other types of doctors enjoy corresponding rights with no such requirement. Some have questioned whether a proposal of this kind may be unconstitutional and discriminatory. It would also be highly impractical, as it raises numerous dilemmas regarding patient rights, insurance issues, patient confidentiality, and more. Second, this bill would require naturopathic physicians to submit monthly reports to the board detailing every single item they prescribe, and require the board to report this data to the legislature annually. Again, this is blatantly unfair, since no corresponding requirement is placed on other types of physicians. It is also impractical and cumbersome: it would place a completely unnecessary burden of paperwork on many of our most valuable primary care physicians - which Hawaii already has a shortage of. And SB2577 SD1 would further hinder the prescription process by requiring naturopathic physicians to receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item on their own formulary.

Last but not least objectionable, SB2577 SD1 would also place inappropriate and unreasonable limits on the naturopathic formulary by excluding such current prescription items as certain injectable medicines, vaccines, and medical oxygen.

There’s no logical reason why naturopathic physicians should be singled out for any of the above-mentioned excesses of SB2577 SD1. To the contrary, since naturopathic physicians received prescriptive authority nearly five years ago, no evidence of patient harm regarding their prescription rights has been brought to the board, and there has been no overuse of prescriptive authority and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. In addition, the public has benefitted enormously as a result of the current prescriptive rights of naturopathic physicians; countless people have improved their health, and the public continues to overwhelmingly support those rights.

Furthermore, in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights there’s no precedent for such restrictive requirements as those proposed in SB2577 SD1. In fact, the Hawaii board has already adopted standards of practice, care, competency, and safety for naturopathic physicians that are among the most rigorous in the nation. Hawaii’s naturopathic physicians have even gone so far as to voluntarily recommend that they complete 15 hours of continuing education

bi-annually in pharmacology. (By the way, this is the ONLY portion of SB2577 SD1 that is reasonable and should be proposed.)

SB2577 SD1 is a highly regressive proposal reflecting a failure to honor and understand an entire profession. It would reverse many positive gains that naturopathic physicians have rightfully achieved, and by reducing the effectiveness of many of our very best primary care doctors, have numerous negative consequences for the people of Hawaii. Thank you for your consideration of my testimony in strong opposition to this bill.

Sincerely,

Karen Yamamoto

3461-A Akaka Place Honolulu, HI 96822

February 18, 2014

My Position: Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians
To Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I go to a regular M.D. doctor and also to a naturopathic doctor. I believe in both conventional and alternative medicine. I have been going to my naturopathic doctor for over 20 years and am pleased that I have this choice to seek treatment for conditions which I feel alternative medicine would be better than conventional medicine. This bill SB2577 would greatly hinder those of us who want this option. I would think the Hawaii legislature and medical profession would look favorably in having lower medical costs and healthier individuals, instead of hindering them.

1. Despite overwhelming opposition to the bill, why is a second hearing scheduled?
2. Why are Sakoda Construction and other individuals in support of the bill?
3. Who introduced this bill and for what reason?

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would restrict my naturopathic physician from being able to write prescriptions that are important in the health care of my family. Although naturopathic physicians try to minimize the use of prescription medications, in many cases they are essential to the practice of integrative family medicine.

There is no rational basis for this legislation. Since the Legislature authorized prescriptive rights for Hawaii's naturopathic physicians, there have been:

- No complaints brought to the Hawaii State Naturopathic Board regarding prescriptive use by naturopathic physicians
- No cases of naturopathic physicians using prescriptions outside their training and scope of practice
- No overuse of prescriptive authority by naturopathic physicians
- No lawsuits filed in this regard

Instead, the vast majority of the testimony already submitted regarding SB2577 shows that the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear

criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, not when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,
Brooke Johns

Testimony in Opposition to SB 2577 SD1:

Naturopathic physicians (NDs) are an asset to our health care system in several ways and should remain independent practitioners. This bill would force NDs into a subordinate role and to limit their scope of practice, while burdening MDs and the Board.

NDs have had an important medical role since 1927 in Hawaii as well-educated, well-trained, well-equipped primary care doctors. Naturopathic physicians throughout the Hawaiian Islands cooperate, consult and maintain positive relationships with other health professionals and MDs when it is in the best interest of the patient.

Naturopathic physicians are currently required to recognize and exercise professional judgment within the limits of the naturopathic physician's qualifications, and seek counsel or make referrals as appropriate.

Our testimony in opposition to SB 2577 SD1 is based on our personal and professional experience. We have both referred to and personally consulted with Naturopathic physicians and found them to be of excellent benefit. This bill would unfairly limit NDs capability which would inhibit their ability to serve and practice independently and contribute to the health of the Hawaiian people.

Thank you for your careful consideration in this matter.

Barbara & Michael Gach, Ph.D.

P.O. Box 1808; Kihei, HI 96753

Aloha, thank you, as my government official for your assistance in protecting my rights to liberty, safety and health within society. As such I state that I am vehemently opposed to bill SB2577-SD1.

Among others my reasons for such an absolute position of opposition are as follows:

- 1) No board action has ever been brought against a practicing ND. Naturopathic physician in 30, since our longest practicing Naturopaths have been in Hawaii.
- 2) Furthermore humanity and each individual must be able to select its healthcare approach and providers.
- 3) I have seen many instances in which the excellence of Naturopathic physicians has restored health to patients whose conditions were exacerbated by allopathic methods. Working together with Naturopaths these patients, who were at a loss, regained health through natural methods prescribed by their naturopaths. I've seen many such cases. The excellence of naturopathic methods shines again and again due to their coherent understanding of a picture of human health within a larger whole.
- 4) Critically also, in situations of urgency, lag time for Naturopaths to wait for MD approval would be a dangerous imposition to healthcare providers overall. The paucity of doctors is dangerous as it is and their current work load would prevent timely swift interaction for such dispensary approvals. This would in fact cause further impediments to our already taxed health care system. Naturopaths need to retain autonomy to prescribe decisive treatments with effective speed.

Please leave the practice parameters for naturopathic physicians as established in 2010 as they stand. Thank you.

Sincerely, Isis Media Morrison

Anna Caleda

94-994 Hanauna St #9G Waipahu Hi 96797

February 17, 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other-Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training

in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,

Anna Caleda

Victoria Rea

February 18, 2014

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

I am alive today only because of naturopathic intervention!!!

Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have

recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

SB2577 SD1 requires your Naturopathic Physician to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their

practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If SB2577 SD1 is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians.

Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you kindly,

Victoria Rea

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would restrict naturopathic physicians from being able to write prescriptions that are important in the health care of my family. Although naturopathic physicians try to minimize the use of prescription medications, in many cases they are essential to the practice of integrative family medicine.

There is no rational basis for this legislation. Since the Legislature authorized prescriptive rights for Hawaii's naturopathic physicians, there have been:

- No complaints brought to the Hawaii State Naturopathic Board regarding prescriptive use by naturopathic physicians
- No cases of naturopathic physicians using prescriptions outside their training and scope of practice
- No overuse of prescriptive authority by naturopathic physicians
- No lawsuits filed in this regard

Instead, the vast majority of the testimony already submitted regarding SB2577 shows that the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of naturopathic physicians far exceeds that of any MD in many areas essential to health care. MDs receive little training in nutrition and a training primarily in prescribing pharmaceuticals and procedures. NDs focus on treating the SOURCE of illness, which often has a NUTRITIONAL basis. MDs tend to resort to superficially chasing symptoms with drugs, as their training has instructed them to do. As a hospital nurse, I was responsible for administering medications to patients, some of whom were prescribed up to a dozen or

more per shift. If you don't believe this can have negative repercussions on health, I urge you to read (pharmacist) Suzy Cohen's book, Drug Muggers, which outlines the nutritional deficiencies caused by taking various classes of drugs, thereby leading to the prescription of more drugs to treat new symptoms that emerge as a result of taking prescription drugs. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, not when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect our access to the high level of naturopathic care that we ALL, including you and your families, deserve. I have several acquaintances who have had successful resolutions to serious medical conditions after being treated by naturopaths with nutritional supplements and dietary recommendations, but who were worse off during therapy with MDs whose treatment involved only pharmaceutical agents. Even if you have never been to a naturopath and don't fully understand their scope of practice, please uphold the freedom of other members of our community to have access to naturopathic care as an alternative to allopathic care.

If you are not yet familiar with *Codex Alimentarius*, please watch this lecture among many others and learn more about this plan which will diminish our health freedom. I would not be surprised to learn that the pharmaceutical industry is responsible for promoting this and similar legislation locally and globally.

Thank you,
Laurie West, RN, BSN
Kailua, HI

February 18, 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I am a 21 year old student. Over the years I have experimented with different medicinal approaches to various illnesses and injuries. I am comfortable and in moral support of my choice in my naturopathic doctor. I use my doctor as a resource for body and mind wellness. If regulations hinder my doctors ability to support me, I will see this as yet another short coming on the part of the officials in charge of equality distributing my tax dollars. Bill **SB2577 SD1** will make medical coverage infinitely more complex for the people of Hawaii. The government is task with helping people find health care coverage, not taking it away from them.

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights

that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

SB2577 SD1 requires your Naturopathic Physician to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived

proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If SB2577 SD1 is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians.

Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

If bill **SB2577 SD1** is an attempt to force those of us who prefer holistic medicinal practices to switch to western medicine it will not work. Each of us has the freedom to surround our lives in the support we feel is most beneficial.

Thank you,

Megan Howard (Resident of Kona)

CASSANDRA ROBINSON
2042 SE SALMON ST
PORTLAND, OR 97214

February 18, 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other-Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals

untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Cassandra Robinson, MS, LPN

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

SB2577 SD1 requires your Naturopathic Physician to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts

prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If SB2577 SD1 is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians.

Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,
Victoria Rea

Jan Roberts
PO Box 1561
Kapaau, HI 96755
February 18, 2014

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H Baker, Chair;
The Honorable Senator Brian T Taniguchi, Vice Chair;
And other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer
Protection

Several years ago I had severe bronchitis and it was necessary for my naturopath to prescribe
prescriptions drugs for me. She is careful and conscientious, and in a day when preventative
medicine is encouraged, why would you want to restrict the doctors who help heal with limited
use of prescription drugs? This makes no sense.

Please oppose bill SB2577 SD1, which would force naturopathic physicians to give up or restrict
their prescription rights. My naturopathic doctor has prescribed prescription drugs for me
throughout the years and this is an invaluable aid to my health. To take away this right would be
an unreasonable burden for myself and my family. There has been no overuse of prescriptive
authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of
practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard.

My naturopath is highly qualified. She spent 5 years in naturopathic medical
school, apprenticed to a world renowned herbalist, and is one of the top healers on the
island. The future of medicine is in preventative care and people taking responsibility for their
health. Healthcare costs can be lowered by naturopathic medicine. Please do not take that
ability away from us.

Sincerely,

Jan Roberts

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board.

There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,

Suzy Fraser
75-195 Ala-Onaona Street
Kailua-Kona
96740 HI

February 18th, 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to
Naturopathic Physicians

Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference
Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the
Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other
Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce
and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of

naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

SB2577 SD1 requires your Naturopathic Physician to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless

implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices.

These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If SB2577 SD1 is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians.

Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,
Suzy Fraser

Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,

Dr. Minna Yoon, ND, L.Ac.
Bay Natural Medicine
919 Irving Street, Suite 104
San Francisco, CA 94122
(415) 564-3200
www.baynaturalmedicine.com

Confidentiality Notice: This email message, including any attachments is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information or otherwise be protected by law. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I am writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1, the bill which would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. Their ability to do that is an important part of my family's health care.

I have personally greatly benefitted from being under the care of my naturopathic physician since 1999. To have my doctor be burdened with inappropriate, impractical and totally unnecessary requirements would create a detrimental effect on the proper care I am currently receiving. My doctor spends at least one hour with me each visit. I would hate to see my visits reduced to 10 minutes because my doctor is now overburdened with additional unnecessary requirements.

I also oppose this bill because it would require my naturopathic doctor to have an MD review all prescriptions given to me. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions because they have very little, if any, training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. One of the reasons why I started seeing a naturopath was because of the ill effects of the drugs my MD was giving me. To have the same MD review my naturopath's treatment simply does not make sense.

Because insurance doesn't cover it, each of my visits to my naturopath is paid out of pocket. Why would I want to pay out of pocket for my naturopathic visits when I have insurance to see a "regular" MD? Simply because I get results from my naturopath.

In closing, I am again asking that you please oppose this bill. We all know people who depend on naturopathic treatments. Let's have them get the proper treatment they deserve.

Thank you,

Lloyd Okada

99-590 Hoio St.
Aiea, HI 96701

February 18/2014

February , 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

In my opinion, having a podiatrist supervise a physical therapist's recommendations, or having a medical doctor supervise an osteopaths' manipulation is as unwarranted and complicated as having an ND be supervised in prescriptions by any other provider. The data below show how unwarranted this truly is.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well-defined.

Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A

naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, not when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice

would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,

Dr. Julie Lachman
196 W. Ashland St.
Doylestown, PA 18901
P: (267) 897-1733
F: 1-(888)-972-5592
www.drlachman.com

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefited greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you.

John Cragg
Kaua'i

February 18th, 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians
Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provides oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable

requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,

Dallas Piana
2552 NW Mildred St
Portland, OR 97210

Kate Young
10883 SE 10th St Apt B11
Vancouver, WA 98664
February 18th, 2014
Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians
Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provides oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it

appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,

Kate Young

have a blessed day,

Kate Young
Sobieski INC . 360 931 9492
<http://cutcoclosinggifts.com/home.jsp>

Brian Chossek
2568 Channel Drive
Ventura, CA 93003

February 17, 2014

Position of Testimony: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

The hearing for this measure is at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

As a regular visitor to Hawaii, I hope that you will do everything you can to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would require naturopathic physicians to reduce or give up prescription rights that are necessary to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the inappropriate restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care. I've seen Naturopathic Doctor's since my childhood. They've solved health issues no traditional doctor could. Now, my wife sees Naturopathic Doctors related to several issues conventional doctors could not ameliorate. The results were excellent.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefited greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined.

Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board.

This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care.

Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, not when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,

Brian Chossek

Jennifer Kane
2727 Akalani Loop
Pukalani, HI 96768

February 18, 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it

appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,
Mahalo to you!

Expanded Exposure LLC
Jennifer Kane
808-280-2147
jenkane808@gmail.com

Kellie Tateyama
91-211 Kai'ele'ele Place
Ewa Beach, HI. 96706

My Position: Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians To Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to voice very strong objections to SB2577 SD1. The Legislature received well over 300 emails opposing SB2577, and only three in support, yet the Committee Report (SB2577 SD1 SSCR2244) seemed to ignore this, stating only that the committee "received testimony in opposition to this measure from Sakoda Construction, LLC, and several individuals." Why was a second hearing scheduled when there was such overwhelming opposition to this bill? SB2577 SD1 would require naturopathic physicians to unreasonably reduce their current prescription rights - integral to their services - and add unfair burdens to their practices. This bill is illogical, unnecessary, and clearly biased against the naturopathic profession. It seems intended to foster conflict rather than cooperation in Hawaii's integrative health care community, and it's based on faulty assumptions about the education of naturopathic physicians. For example, the Committee Report incorrectly states that the education of naturopathic physicians "offers very few contact hours of study on pharmacological treatment of disease." In fact, the hours of pharmacology training for naturopathic physicians are nearly the same as that of MDs, and greater than that of osteopaths.

There are so many problems with this bill that adequately describing them all would require dozens of pages of testimony. The following is a brief summary, beginning with its most egregious flaws.

First, this bill essentially proposes that naturopathic physicians, in order to continue qualifying for the prescription privileges the legislature wisely granted them (with overwhelming public support) years ago, would be required to have MDs "review" all of their prescriptions. According to the bill, these MDs would then "address any concerns" with these prescriptions, including the actual amounts prescribed, to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is worse than illogical, because:

1. The training of MDs does not at all qualify them for such a role. Allopathic education, compared to naturopathic education, has far fewer standards and requirements for training in the use of natural and preventive treatment modalities. SB2577 SD1 reflects a misunderstanding of, or a disregard for, what a naturopathic physician is. The entire point of naturopathic physician's education and training is to become a distinctly different type of medical expert than an MD - one who is highly educated in an alternative system of medicine that differs in many ways from that of conventional allopathic physicians. MDs are not equipped by their training to provide a meaningful review of naturopathic prescriptions, or have a comprehensive understanding of the complex issues they involve. (In an attempt to defend the bill, the Committee Report states that "naturopathic education differs from that received within allopathic or osteopathic medical schools." You cannot have it both ways; if the training is different, then it makes no sense for MDs to review naturopathic prescriptions.)
2. The extensive medical training of naturopathic physicians already more than qualifies them for their current prescription privileges.
3. Such a proposal is conspicuously one-sided and unfair. Is a corresponding requirement placed on MDs and other health care providers? Should MDs be required to have naturopathic physicians

review and monitor all of their prescription activities, since the training of naturopathic physicians is much more extensive in many important areas (particularly those pertaining to a broad range of natural and preventive treatments) than that of MDs?

4. Appointing one type of physician to “oversee” another’s jurisdiction raises all manner of legal and ethical concerns. It would be terrible public policy to require one kind of doctor to answer to another kind of doctor, trained in a different form of medicine, in order to simply maintain the prescription rights they were trained to have, especially when other types of doctors enjoy corresponding rights with no such requirement. Some have questioned whether a proposal of this kind may be unconstitutional and discriminatory. It would also be highly impractical, as it raises numerous dilemmas regarding patient rights, insurance issues, patient confidentiality, and more. Second, this bill would require naturopathic physicians to submit monthly reports to the board detailing every single item they prescribe, and require the board to report this data to the legislature annually. Again, this is blatantly unfair, since no corresponding requirement is placed on other types of physicians. It is also impractical and cumbersome: it would place a completely unnecessary burden of paperwork on many of our most valuable primary care physicians - which Hawaii already has a shortage of. And SB2577 SD1 would further hinder the prescription process by requiring naturopathic physicians to receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item on their own formulary.

Last but not least objectionable, SB2577 SD1 would also place inappropriate and unreasonable limits on the naturopathic formulary by excluding such current prescription items as certain injectable medicines, vaccines, and medical oxygen.

There’s no logical reason why naturopathic physicians should be singled out for any of the above-mentioned excesses of SB2577 SD1. To the contrary, since naturopathic physicians received prescriptive authority nearly five years ago, no evidence of patient harm regarding their prescription rights has been brought to the board, and there has been no overuse of prescriptive authority and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. In addition, the public has benefitted enormously as a result of the current prescriptive rights of naturopathic physicians; countless people have improved their health, and the public continues to overwhelmingly support those rights. Furthermore, in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights there’s no precedent for such restrictive requirements as those proposed in SB2577 SD1. In fact, the Hawaii board has already adopted standards of practice, care, competency, and safety for naturopathic physicians that are among the most rigorous in the nation. Hawaii’s naturopathic physicians have even gone so far as to voluntarily recommend that they complete 15 hours of continuing education bi-annually in pharmacology. (By the way, this is the ONLY portion of SB2577 SD1 that is reasonable and should be proposed.)

SB2577 SD1 is a highly regressive proposal reflecting a failure to honor and understand an entire profession. It would reverse many positive gains that naturopathic physicians have rightfully achieved, and by reducing the effectiveness of many of our very best primary care doctors, have numerous negative consequences for the people of Hawaii. Thank you for your consideration of my testimony in strong opposition to this bill.

Sincerely,
Kellie

Subject Line: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would restrict my naturopathic physician from being able to write prescriptions that are important in the health care of my family and many families with children with special needs. Traditional doctors are not trained to treat children with Autism and ADHD. Our current Natropathic doctor specializes in Autism and ADHD. By passing this bill you are going to effect the care of many children with special needs, including my 4 year old son. It is important for our Natropath to have the ability to prescribe medicines for my son. If she is not able to, then we have to find another doctor. She is currently the only doctor in our state who specializes in Autism and ADHD biomedical treatment. Taking away her ability to help our children will be devastating for our family and so many others.

There is no rational basis for this legislation. Since the Legislature authorized prescriptive rights for Hawaii's naturopathic physicians, there have been:

- No complaints brought to the Hawaii State Naturopathic Board regarding prescriptive use by naturopathic physicians**
- No cases of naturopathic physicians using prescriptions outside their training and scope of practice**
- No overuse of prescriptive authority by naturopathic physicians**
- No lawsuits filed in this regard**

Natropathic doctors are vital to many children in the special needs community. My son, Ethan, has several medical conditions that traditional doctors do not understand or know how to treat. Please remember children like Ethan, who depend on prescriptions from his Natropathic doctor. Without these prescriptions, Ethan's quality of life will decrease as well as his level of functioning.

**Respectfully,
Brandi M. Picardal
94-1415 Welina Loop, Apt. 8B
Waipahu, HI 96797**

Sarah Ann Gilman
12A Kailua Road
Kailua, HI 96734
February 17, 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians fully prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care are already in place that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have earned prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create

endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and parenteral therapy, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I demand.

Thank you,
Sarah Gilman

Patricia Kennedy, D.C

February 15, 2014

My Position: Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

To Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to voice very strong objections to SB2577 SD1. The Legislature received well over 300 emails opposing SB2577, and only three in support, yet the Committee Report (SB2577 SD1 SSCR2244) seemed to ignore this, stating only that the committee "received testimony in opposition to this measure from Sakoda Construction, LLC, and several individuals." Why was a second hearing scheduled when there was such overwhelming opposition to this bill?

SB2577 SD1 would require naturopathic physicians to unreasonably reduce their current prescription rights - integral to their services - and add unfair burdens to their practices. This bill is illogical, unnecessary, and clearly biased against the naturopathic profession. It seems intended to foster conflict rather than cooperation in Hawaii's integrative health care community, and it's based on faulty assumptions about the education of naturopathic physicians. For example, the Committee Report incorrectly states that the education of naturopathic physicians "offers very few contact hours of study on pharmacological treatment of disease." In fact, the hours of pharmacology training for naturopathic physicians are nearly the same as that of MDs, and greater than that of osteopaths.

There are so many problems with this bill that adequately describing them all would require dozens of pages of testimony. The following is a brief summary, beginning with its most egregious flaws.

First, this bill essentially proposes that naturopathic physicians, in order to continue qualifying for the prescription privileges the legislature wisely granted them (with overwhelming public support) years ago, would be required to have MDs "review" all of their prescriptions. According to the bill, these MDs would then "address any concerns" with these prescriptions, including the actual amounts prescribed, to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is worse than illogical, because:

1. The training of MDs does not at all qualify them for such a role. Allopathic education, compared to naturopathic education, has far fewer standards and requirements for training in the use of natural and preventive treatment modalities. SB2577 SD1 reflects a misunderstanding of, or a disregard for, what a naturopathic physician is. The entire point of naturopathic physician's education and training is to become a distinctly different type of medical expert than an MD - one who is highly educated in an alternative system of medicine that differs in many ways from that of conventional allopathic physicians. MDs are not equipped by their training to provide a meaningful review of naturopathic prescriptions, or have a comprehensive understanding of the complex issues they involve. (In an attempt to defend the bill, the Committee Report states that "naturopathic education differs from that received within allopathic or osteopathic medical schools." You cannot have it both ways; if the training is different, then it makes no sense for MDs to review naturopathic prescriptions.)
2. The extensive medical training of naturopathic physicians already more than qualifies them for their current prescription privileges.
3. Such a proposal is conspicuously one-sided and unfair. Is a corresponding requirement placed on MDs and other health care providers? Should MDs be required to have naturopathic physicians review and monitor all of their prescription activities, since the training of naturopathic physicians is much more extensive in many important areas (particularly those pertaining to a broad range of natural and preventive treatments) than that of MDs?
4. Appointing one type of physician to "oversee" another's jurisdiction raises all manner of legal and ethical concerns. It would be terrible public policy to require one kind of doctor to answer to another

kind of doctor, trained in a different form of medicine, in order to simply maintain the prescription rights they were trained to have, especially when other types of doctors enjoy corresponding rights with no such requirement. Some have questioned whether a proposal of this kind may be unconstitutional and discriminatory. It would also be highly impractical, as it raises numerous dilemmas regarding patient rights, insurance issues, patient confidentiality, and more. Second, this bill would require naturopathic physicians to submit monthly reports to the board detailing every single item they prescribe, and require the board to report this data to the legislature annually. Again, this is blatantly unfair, since no corresponding requirement is placed on other types of physicians. It is also impractical and cumbersome: it would place a completely unnecessary burden of paperwork on many of our most valuable primary care physicians - which Hawaii already has a shortage of. And SB2577 SD1 would further hinder the prescription process by requiring naturopathic physicians to receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item on their own formulary.

Last but not least objectionable, SB2577 SD1 would also place inappropriate and unreasonable limits on the naturopathic formulary by excluding such current prescription items as certain injectable medicines, vaccines, and medical oxygen.

There's no logical reason why naturopathic physicians should be singled out for any of the above-mentioned excesses of SB2577 SD1. To the contrary, since naturopathic physicians received prescriptive authority nearly five years ago, no evidence of patient harm regarding their prescription rights has been brought to the board, and there has been no overuse of prescriptive authority and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. In addition, the public has benefitted enormously as a result of the current prescriptive rights of naturopathic physicians; countless people have improved their health, and the public continues to overwhelmingly support those rights. Furthermore, in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights there's no precedent for such restrictive requirements as those proposed in SB2577 SD1. In fact, the Hawaii board has already adopted standards of practice, care, competency, and safety for naturopathic physicians that are among the most rigorous in the nation. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even gone so far as to voluntarily recommend that they complete 15 hours of continuing education bi-annually in pharmacology. (By the way, this is the ONLY portion of SB2577 SD1 that is reasonable and should be proposed.)

SB2577 SD1 is a highly regressive proposal reflecting a failure to honor and understand an entire profession. It would reverse many positive gains that naturopathic physicians have rightfully achieved, and by reducing the effectiveness of many of our very best primary care doctors, have numerous negative consequences for the people of Hawaii. Thank you for your consideration of my testimony in strong opposition to this bill.

Sincerely,

Dr. Patricia Kennedy, D.C.

Tim Dobbins
P.O. Box 31186
Honolulu, HI 96820

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other distinguished Members of the Senate committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection: I am writing to request that you oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would require naturopathic physicians to restrict prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions, without unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD 1, is an important part of my health care. Thank you, Tim Dobbins

Nika Cantor
77-6453 Seaview Circle.
Kailua-Kona 96740

February 17 , 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

SB2577 SD1 requires your Naturopathic Physician to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their

own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If SB2577 SD1 is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians.

Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,

Nika Cantor
77-6453 Seaview Circle
Kailua- Kona, HI. 96740
808-896-0520

Brittany Botheras
1112 Kinau St #705
Honolulu, HI 96814
February 17, 2014

My Position: Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians
To Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members
of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I am writing to voice very strong objections to SB2577 SD1. The Legislature received well over 300 emails opposing SB2577, and only three in support, yet the Committee Report (SB2577 SD1 SSCR2244) seemed to ignore this, stating only that the committee "received testimony in opposition to this measure from Sakoda Construction, LLC, and several individuals." Why was a second hearing scheduled when there was such overwhelming opposition to this bill?

This matter affects me and my family very deeply because we depend completely on our naturopathic physicians for all of our healthcare needs.

SB2577 SD1 would require naturopathic physicians to unreasonably reduce their current prescription rights - integral to their services - and add unfair burdens to their practices. This bill is illogical, unnecessary, and clearly biased against the naturopathic profession. It seems intended to foster conflict rather than cooperation in Hawaii's integrative health care community, and it's based on faulty assumptions about the education of naturopathic physicians. For example, the Committee Report incorrectly states that the education of naturopathic physicians "offers very few contact hours of study on pharmacological treatment of disease." In fact, the hours of pharmacology training for naturopathic physicians are nearly the same as that of MDs, and greater than that of osteopaths.

There are so many problems with this bill that adequately describing them all would require dozens of pages of testimony. The following is a brief summary, beginning with its most egregious flaws.

First, this bill essentially proposes that naturopathic physicians, in order to continue qualifying for the prescription privileges the legislature wisely granted them (with overwhelming public support) years ago, would be required to have MDs "review" all of their prescriptions. According to the bill, these MDs would then "address any concerns" with these prescriptions, including the actual amounts prescribed, to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is worse than illogical, because:

1. The training of MDs does not at all qualify them for such a role. Allopathic education, compared to naturopathic education, has far fewer standards and requirements for training in the use of natural and preventive treatment modalities. SB2577 SD1 reflects a misunderstanding of, or a disregard for, what a naturopathic physician is. The entire point of naturopathic physician's education and training is to become a distinctly different type of medical expert than an MD - one who is highly educated in an alternative system of medicine that differs in many ways from that of conventional allopathic physicians. MDs are not equipped by their training to provide a meaningful review of naturopathic prescriptions, or have a comprehensive understanding of the complex issues they involve. (In an attempt to defend the bill, the Committee Report states that "naturopathic education differs from that received within allopathic or osteopathic medical schools." You cannot have it both ways; if the training is different, then it makes no sense for MDs to review naturopathic prescriptions.)
2. The extensive medical training of naturopathic physicians already more than qualifies them for their current prescription privileges.
3. Such a proposal is conspicuously one-sided and unfair. Is a corresponding requirement placed on MDs and other health care providers? Should MDs be required to have naturopathic physicians review and monitor all

of their prescription activities, since the training of naturopathic physicians is much more extensive in many important areas (particularly those pertaining to a broad range of natural and preventive treatments) than that of MDs?

4. Appointing one type of physician to "oversee" another's jurisdiction raises all manner of legal and ethical concerns. It would be terrible public policy to require one kind of doctor to answer to another kind of doctor, trained in a different form of medicine, in order to simply maintain the prescription rights they were trained to have, especially when other types of doctors enjoy corresponding rights with no such requirement. Some have questioned whether a proposal of this kind may be unconstitutional and discriminatory. It would also be highly impractical, as it raises numerous dilemmas regarding patient rights, insurance issues, patient confidentiality, and more.

Second, this bill would require naturopathic physicians to submit monthly reports to the board detailing every single item they prescribe, and require the board to report this data to the legislature annually. Again, this is blatantly unfair, since no corresponding requirement is placed on other types of physicians. It is also impractical and cumbersome: it would place a completely unnecessary burden of paperwork on many of our most valuable primary care physicians - which Hawaii already has a shortage of. And SB2577 SD1 would further hinder the prescription process by requiring naturopathic physicians to receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item on their own formulary. Last but not least objectionable, SB2577 SD1 would also place inappropriate and unreasonable limits on the naturopathic formulary by excluding such current prescription items as certain injectable medicines, vaccines, and medical oxygen.

There's no logical reason why naturopathic physicians should be singled out for any of the above-mentioned excesses of SB2577 SD1. To the contrary, since naturopathic physicians received prescriptive authority nearly five years ago, no evidence of patient harm regarding their prescription rights has been brought to the board, and there has been no overuse of prescriptive authority and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. In addition, the public has benefitted enormously as a result of the current prescriptive rights of naturopathic physicians; countless people have improved their health, and the public continues to overwhelmingly support those rights. Furthermore, in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights there's no precedent for such restrictive requirements as those proposed in SB2577 SD1. In fact, the Hawaii board has already adopted standards of practice, care, competency, and safety for naturopathic physicians that are among the most rigorous in the nation. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even gone so far as to voluntarily recommend that they complete 15 hours of continuing education bi-annually in pharmacology. (By the way, this is the ONLY portion of SB2577 SD1 that is reasonable and should be proposed.)

SB2577 SD1 is a highly regressive proposal reflecting a failure to honor and understand an entire profession. It would reverse many positive gains that naturopathic physicians have rightfully achieved, and by reducing the effectiveness of many of our very best primary care doctors, have numerous negative consequences for the people of Hawaii. Thank you for your consideration of my testimony in strong opposition to this bill.

Sincerely,
Brittany Botheras

February 17, 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians fully prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care are already in place that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have earned prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and parenteral therapy, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I demand.

Thank you,
Marla Chong-Furtado

I am a naturopathic physician. I graduated from a 4-year, federally accredited naturopathic medical school and passed all parts of the NPLEx exam. I currently practice in Idaho.

I believe SB2577 is flawed for several reasons.

It puts an unfair burden on a primary care provider to report to another primary care provider.

Naturopathic physicians are trained in prescribing medications as well as prescribing natural substances. They are tested on a national exam. the use of medicine is not a right by only one type of primary care provider.

Unless there is proof that average number of prescription errors written by naturopathic physicians are higher than the MD record, this bill should be seen more from the point of view of commerce, not a practice act.

Unless the harm created by naturopathic prescribing is greater than the harm created by medical doctor prescribing, this bill should be seen as unnecessarily punitive and restricting trade and competition.

The statistics should show that naturopathic prescribing is safe and only done when indicated.

Please see this bill as what it is: a restriction in trade and competition between two trades providing primary care.

At time when preventable medical illness are high and primary care physicians are short in number, restricting trade does not benefit the public.

Please vote not on SB2577

Dr. Sara Rodgers, ND

--

*Idaho Naturopathic Medicine
office of Dr. Sara Rodgers, NMD
6550 W Emerald St., Suite 112
Boise, Idaho 83704
PH: 208-275-0007
FAX: 208-323-9909
www.idnatmed.com*

The materials in this emails are private and may contain Protected Healthcare Information. If you are not the intended recipient, be advised that any unauthorized use, disclosure, copying, distribution, or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please immediately notify Idaho Naturopathic Medicine, LLC via telephone or return mail. Thank You.

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. A naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care options.

I have learned that since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Why try to "fix" something that is not broken. Please put this bill in the trash can!

Lynn Studer
17312 NE Stoney Meadows Dr.
Vancouver, WA 98682

February 18th, 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians
Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provides oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice,

safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care

providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,

Lynn Studer

Aloha,

I am writing this email to oppose SB2577SD1. The Naturapathic Doctor I am seeing is extremely knowledgeable, competent, professional with decades of training and experience. There is a need for both orthodox and natural medicine, and both physicians can complement each other but the difference is like night/day, apples to oranges. Orthodox doctors do not have training in fields such as nutrition, but Naturapathic doctors are very well versed. Many, many, many disorders are caused by poor diets and inadequate nutrition, and health can be dramatically improved simply by knowing the difference. You ARE what you eat.

I have a very good medical plan, so I do not have any obstacles in the type of service I seek for my health care. I use both types of physicians depending on my medical needs.

By being educated by my Naturapathic doctor, my cholesterol dropped by 30 points, glucose dropped by 20 and my blood pressure is better than perfect, all in ONE MONTHS time simply by eating smarter, avoiding GMO foods and reading nutrition labels and the ingredients of the food I purchase. My primary doctor would simply say that including more fruits/vegetables couldn't hurt and prescribe me a pill that would address the symptom but not address the cause. The very fact that my health insurance does not cover 99% of the services provided by my Naturapathic doctor does not deter me from seeking their help.

You've heard the saying, "Give a person a fish and they will eat for a day, but teach them to fish and they will eat for a lifetime." Well, my primary doctor gives me fish, but my naturapathic doctor is teaching me to fish.

I don't want my Naturapathic doctor's method of treatment for me be dependent on the permission or control of any conventional doctor or board decision. There is no need for that. If a condition exists that needs conventional attention, they are quick to make that recommendation. They fill a specialty that is not filled by conventional medicine and do not directly compete. By passing this bill, you are simply taking away my choice for an extremely personal decision that the government should not be involved with.

I am against the passage of SB2577SD1.

Thank you for allowing me to submit this testimony.

Joanne Ryckman

April Golden
3608 NE 38th Ave.
Vancouver, WA 98661

February 19th, 2014

Position: Strong Oppostion to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provides oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,



Melissa brewer 5391 makaloa st

February , 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other-Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefited greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you.

February , 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, not when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that

they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,
Diana Limoge
PO Box 791046
Paia, HI 96779

SB2577

Submitted on: 2/18/2014

Testimony for CPN on Feb 20, 2014 10:30AM in Conference Room 229

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Valerie Colter	Individual	Comments Only	No

Comments: Please do not take away any doctoring power from Naturopathic Doctors, including the right to prescribe medications of all kinds. The public needs options. Also we have too few doctors here and urgent care clinics are overloaded as well.

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

Kathy Corcoran
Lahaina

February , 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To:

Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair

Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair

other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you defeat SB2577 SD1.

To require that naturopathic physicians have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts

prescribed, defeats the purpose of consulting a naturopath in the first place! Naturopathic doctors are trained physicians in their own right, and the education of my own naturopathic physician far exceeded that

of any MD in the areas essential to my health care. This bill is just a way to force people to use MDs when

they prefer to avoid MDs. Why are you guys picking on our naturopaths?

I do not need an MD to approve my NDs prescriptions, when she is already a graduate of better medical training than MDs! Why are MDs the standard anyway? Way too many people die in the hospital from malpractice by MDs! Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with

other health professionals when necessary.

You *know* the insurance situation would be a nightmare, and the vital doctor-patient confidentiality would vanish.

This bill is frightening to me, because it shows that somebody who is very ignorant is abusing their position in the

legislature by exercising their ignorance in ways that harm their constituents, both patients and our personal

naturopathic physicians. Please be aware: I observe, I comment, and I vote.

Sincerely, Kathy Corcoran
Lahaina

> I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, not when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more. >

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that

SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers. at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,

Cathrine A.

Grace

. A registered voter & constituent from the Big Island

Aloha Senators Baker, Taniguchi and members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection,

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to OPPOSE SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Mahalo,
Ashina Ashina
Kapaa, Kauai 96746

February 18, 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, not when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the

Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Lisa Shaver". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Lisa Shaver

Arlene Larrua
68-3522 Malina St.
Waikoloa HI 96738
Registered Voter District 6

February 17, 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other-Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, not when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,

Arlene Larrua

Testimony Against Bill SB2577 SD1 – I have been under the good care of Dr. Laurie Steelsmith for many years and attribute my good health to her knowledge and wisdom. A number of years ago I was not feeling myself. Dr. Laurie was able to check my thyroid through a blood test only to find I had Hashimoto's Disease. She was able to prescribe the correct medication and I can tell you today I feel like a different woman. Her attention to detail and the time she took to figure out what was wrong with me was admirable. Once this medication began to work on my thyroid -I has able to live a rich and rewarding life. As a tax payer and part of the voting public - I have a right to have MY naturopathic health care be a private matter between me and my naturopathic physician. I also have the right to expect, based on my experience, the ability to have my naturopathic doctor write the appropriate prescription. Bill SB2577 SD1 is a harmful bill and must be stopped! Patty Doo, 2101 Nuuanu Ave., Apt. #1205, Honolulu, Hawaii 96817

PATTY DOO | Senior Account Executive | KGMB – CBS Hawaii



Phone: 808.847.9339 Mobile: 808.291.2910 Fax: 808.845.3616
E-mail: PDoo@KGMB.com
Address: 420 Waiakamilo Road, Suite 205, Honolulu, HI 96817



Always on
HawaiiNewsNow.com

Arlene Larrua
68-3522 Malina St.
Waikoloa HI 96738
Registered Voter District 6

February 17, 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other-Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, not when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

To whom it may concern,

This bill greatly limits naturepathic physicians and interferes with my freedom to choose the care I want to receive. Doctors are untrained in natural medicine and pharmaceutical drugs are one of the highest causes of death. It would be a terrible loss for these practitioners to leave Hawaii because of the restrictive measures in this bill.

Petra Sundheim,
Lihue, Kauai

Arlene Larrua
68-3522 Malina St.
Waikoloa HI 96738
Registered Voter District 6

February 17, 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other-Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, not when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

Roy M. Arakaki
94-1440 Lanikuhana Ave. 454
Mililani, HI 96789

February 17, 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs' review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they

consider it appropriate for the patient, not when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,
Roy M. Arakaki

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, not when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians

are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,

Virgil Tanizaki

Naturopathic Doctor Student

Hawaii Resident

SB2577

Submitted on: 2/18/2014

Testimony for CPN on Feb 20, 2014 10:30AM in Conference Room 229

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Miles Greenberg	Individual	Comments Only	No

Comments: Dear Honorable Chair Baker, Vice Chair Taniguchi and Distinguished Members: I stand on my testimony submitted in HTH and OPPOSE this bill. Senator Green has proposed unprecedented (nationwide) regulation 4 years after the Legislature and DAG completed their due diligence on our prescriptive (NO controlled substances), minor surgery and parenteral privileges. Senator Green, acting as a Senator and as an MD raise the specter of interloper for the Hawaii Medical Association and the American Medical Association as it raises suspicion of a deep conflict of interest. Foisting a "collegial" relationship with MD's to oversee ND prescriptions with Board oversight is far from customary as no RICO complaints or incidents have been filed on an ND for prescription violations or harm. Senator Green disregarded our actual pharmacy hours earned and pharmacy board exam in the language of SCCR 2244. He has also EXCLUDED parenteral drugs (as well as other non-controlled drug classes) despite special Board parenteral credentialing; this has been completely dismissed. Arbitrary and capricious! ND's support resumption of CME's especially for pharmacy at 15 hours biennially. Thank you for OPPOSING SB 2577 SD 1 SCCR2244

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 18 , 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other-Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefited greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal

problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,

--

In Health,

Gretchen Imdieke, N.D.
PO Box 30933, Anahola HI 96703
P: 808-652-6407 F: 808-482-2047
drgretchenimdieke@gmail.com
www.drgretchenimdieke.com

This message is intended for the sole use of the individual and entity to whom it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended addressee, nor authorized to receive for the intended addressee, you are hereby notified that you may not use, copy, disclose, or distribute to anyone the message or any information contained in the message. If you have received this message in error, please immediately advise the sender by reply email and delete the message. Thank you.

Christopher Quinn

84-4778 Tobacco Rd
Honaunau Hi 96726

February 17 , 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of

the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

SB2577 SD1 requires your Naturopathic Physician to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If SB2577 SD1 is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians.

Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,

Christopher Quinn

Abendigo Peter Reeb

4311 SE 37th Ave #27
Portland OR 97202
February 17, 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians
Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other-Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577-SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they

consider it appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,

Abendigo Reeb, Naturopathic Medical Student, Portland, Oregon

Dr Andrea Mills, Ph D
21 Hooia Place
Lahaina Maui HI 96761

February 17, 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other-Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. Naturopathic Medicine has saved my Life. Please, This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.


There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,





Aloha & Best of Health,

Dr. Andrea M. Mills, PhD

Dr.AndreaMills@me.com

Dean of Admissions

1-808-870-6455

My name is Kathleen Holokahi, I am 65 years old and have been a resident of Kailua practically all my life. I am writing to request that you oppose SB2577 SD1. I have no idea why the legislature would want to limit the rights of naturopathic doctors. Tell us what are the reasons. Don't just do things without listening and consulting with the public whom you represent. Maybe you've heard some bad reports about some naturopathic doctors. Well there's also some bad reports of medical doctors as well. I've had some negative experiences with some medical doctors in the past.

I honor the medical doctors. I have a good one but I also have a well-educated naturopathic doctor, Dr. Kathryn Taketa-Wong. Last June I approached my medical doctor suspecting that I have an autoimmune condition called Sjogren's Syndrome. (I researched my symptoms on the Internet and came up with this syndrome). He set me up for a blood test which I tested positive for the autoimmune condition. He did not prescribe anything saying, "unless I wanted steroids". I said, "no". My symptoms of extreme tiredness and dizziness persisted until I couldn't drive on the highways anymore. I had to catch the bus. I then took the lab report to my naturopathic doctor who put me on a food regimen--gluten-free, soy-free, and dairy-free along with some supplements. It was a tremendous change from night to day. I'm not tired all the time as I used to be, my dizziness has subsided substantially. I can now drive on the highways.

Please do not curtail or limit my naturopathic doctor's abilities to treat me. (Some supplements are prescribed). I go to my medical doctor for routine checkups and inform him what I'm doing for my condition. He says, "if it's working, stick to it". What medical doctors cannot do, naturopathic doctors can fill in. Medical science is not the answer for everything. I had toe fungus and my naturopathic doctor prescribed some Chinese medicine and it worked. I had previously asked one of the specialists at Kaiser and he had no answer.

Thank you,

Kathleen Holokahi

Daniel Caputo N.D. L.Ac.

February 17, 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other

Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, not when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very

different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more. SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians. If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,

Daniel Caputo N.D. L.Ac.

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other-Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,

Mac Lowson

SB2577

Submitted on: 2/17/2014

Testimony for CPN on Feb 20, 2014 10:30AM in Conference Room 229

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Susan Douglas	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

Leila Fujii
7037 35th Ave., NE
Seattle, WA 98115
February 17, 2014

My Position: Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians
To Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other
Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer
Protection:

I am from Hawaii and am currently a student of Naturopathic Medicine. I would love to return to HI to practice. Please don't tie my hands. For instance, asthmatics need an albuterol prescription in case their airways narrow so they can breathe and people that have anaphylactic reactions (peanuts, bee stings, etc.) need to have an EPI-pen just in case. There are so many challenges facing residents of Hawaii including obesity, diabetes, and hypertension. Unlike MD's who may only use drugs or surgery, Naturopathic Doctors work with patients on diet, exercise, weight control, stress management, psychological issues, etc. to get to the root of disease.

I'm writing to voice very strong objections to SB2577 SD1. The Legislature received well over 300 emails opposing SB2577, and only three in support, yet the Committee Report (SB2577 SD1 SSCR2244) seemed to ignore this, stating only that the committee "received testimony in opposition to this measure from Sakoda Construction, LLC, and several individuals." Why was a second hearing scheduled when there was such overwhelming opposition to this bill?

SB2577 SD1 would require naturopathic physicians to unreasonably reduce their current prescription rights - integral to their services - and add unfair burdens to their practices. This bill is illogical, unnecessary, and clearly biased against the naturopathic profession. It seems intended to foster conflict rather than cooperation in Hawaii's integrative health care community, and it's based on faulty assumptions about the education of naturopathic physicians. For example, the Committee Report incorrectly states that the education of naturopathic physicians "offers very few contact hours of study on pharmacological treatment of disease." In fact, the hours of pharmacology training for naturopathic physicians are nearly the same as that of MDs, and greater than that of osteopaths.

There are so many problems with this bill that adequately describing them all would require dozens of pages of testimony. The following is a brief summary, beginning with its most egregious flaws.

First, this bill essentially proposes that naturopathic physicians, in order to continue qualifying for the prescription privileges the legislature wisely granted them (with overwhelming public support) years ago, would be required to have MDs "review" all of their prescriptions. According to the bill, these MDs would then "address any concerns" with these prescriptions, including the actual amounts prescribed, to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is worse than illogical, because:

1. The training of MDs does not at all qualify them for such a role. Allopathic education, compared to naturopathic education, has far fewer standards and requirements for training in the use of natural and preventive treatment modalities. SB2577 SD1 reflects

a misunderstanding of, or a disregard for, what a naturopathic physician is. The entire point of naturopathic physician's education and training is to become a distinctly different type of medical expert than an MD - one who is highly educated in an alternative system of medicine that differs in many ways from that of conventional allopathic physicians. MDs are not equipped by their training to provide a meaningful review of naturopathic prescriptions, or have a comprehensive understanding of the complex issues they involve. (In an attempt to defend the bill, the Committee Report states that "naturopathic education differs from that received within allopathic or osteopathic medical schools." You cannot have it both ways; if the training is different, then it makes no sense for MDs to review naturopathic prescriptions.)

2. The extensive medical training of naturopathic physicians already more than qualifies them for their current prescription privileges.

3. Such a proposal is conspicuously one-sided and unfair. Is a corresponding requirement placed on MDs and other health care providers? Should MDs be required to have naturopathic physicians review and monitor all of their prescription activities, since the training of naturopathic physicians is much more extensive in many important areas (particularly those pertaining to a broad range of natural and preventive treatments) than that of MDs?

4. Appointing one type of physician to "oversee" another's jurisdiction raises all manner of legal and ethical concerns. It would be terrible public policy to require one kind of doctor to answer to another kind of doctor, trained in a different form of medicine, in order to simply maintain the prescription rights they were trained to have, especially when other types of doctors enjoy corresponding rights with no such requirement. Some have questioned whether a proposal of this kind may be unconstitutional and discriminatory. It would also be highly impractical, as it raises numerous dilemmas regarding patient rights, insurance issues, patient confidentiality, and more.

Second, this bill would require naturopathic physicians to submit monthly reports to the board detailing every single item they prescribe, and require the board to report this data to the legislature annually. Again, this is blatantly unfair, since no corresponding requirement is placed on other types of physicians. It is also impractical and cumbersome: it would place a completely unnecessary burden of paperwork on many of our most valuable primary care physicians - which Hawaii already has a shortage of. And SB2577 SD1 would further hinder the prescription process by requiring naturopathic physicians to receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item on their own formulary.

Last but not least objectionable, SB2577 SD1 would also place inappropriate and unreasonable limits on the naturopathic formulary by excluding such current prescription items as certain injectable medicines, vaccines, and medical oxygen.

There's no logical reason why naturopathic physicians should be singled out for any of the above-mentioned excesses of SB2577 SD1. To the contrary, since naturopathic physicians received prescriptive authority nearly five years ago, no evidence of patient harm regarding their prescription rights has been brought to the board, and there has been no overuse of prescriptive authority and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. In addition, the public has benefitted enormously as a result of the current prescriptive rights of naturopathic physicians; countless people have improved their health, and the public continues to overwhelmingly support those rights. Furthermore, in other states

where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights there's no precedent for such restrictive requirements as those proposed in SB2577 SD1. In fact, the Hawaii board has already adopted standards of practice, care, competency, and safety for naturopathic physicians that are among the most rigorous in the nation. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even gone so far as to voluntarily recommend that they complete 15 hours of continuing education bi-annually in pharmacology. (By the way, this is the ONLY portion of SB2577 SD1 that is reasonable and should be proposed.) SB2577 SD1 is a highly regressive proposal reflecting a failure to honor and understand an entire profession. It would reverse many positive gains that naturopathic physicians have rightfully achieved, and by reducing the effectiveness of many of our very best primary care doctors, have numerous negative consequences for the people of Hawaii. Thank you for your consideration of my testimony in strong opposition to this bill.

Sincerely,

Leila Fujii

Franz Weber
76-789 'Io Place
Kailua-Kona, Hawaii 96740

February 17, 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to
Naturopathic Physicians

Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room
229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the
Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other
Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce
and Consumer Protection:

**I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to
oppose SB2577 SD1.** This bill would essentially require
naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights
that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability
to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the
unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an
important part of my health care.

**Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic
physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has
been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these
prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has
also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of
naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of
practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard.** Instead, the public
has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of
naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription
privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they
currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice,
which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by

the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

SB2577 SD1 requires your Naturopathic Physician to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their

practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If SB2577 SD1 is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians.

Please, oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve and that I consider to be in accordance with my personal rights and liberties.

Thank you,
Franz Weber

The information contained in this communication is confidential, may be privileged pursuant to the attorney-client privilege and/or the work product doctrine, may constitute inside information, and is intended only for the use of the addressee. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, be advised that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender by return email or by calling (860) 779-2800 ext 35555 and delete this communication and all copies, including all attachments.

From: Laura Maakestad Sullivan
84-680 Kili Drive, #803
Waianae, HI 96792
gaiacorinne@gmail.com

February 19, 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

Hearing at 10:30am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian Tanaguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There is no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature has rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, There has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic board. There has been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians fully prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care are already in place that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have earned prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts they prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of

naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, not when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

Hindering naturopathic physicians in their practice by requiring they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and parenteral therapy, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary places unnecessary burdens on naturopathic physicians in their practices. In some cases, requirement that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may be even discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. I myself have found that a naturopath in my case found a nutritional deficiency directly related to a previously undiagnosed genetic deficiency. In my case the genetic deficiency was confirmed by a genetic test. My primary MD has been supportive and willing to include this new information from the my naturopathic physician into her understanding of my medical needs. As a result of being treated by my naturopathic physician I have had increased health, energy and well being.

Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I demand.

Thank you.

Laura Maakestad Sullivan

Sandra T. Takeshita
1291 Lopaka Place
Kailua, HI 96734

February 17, 2014

Re: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I am a strong proponent of naturopathic medicine for one important reason: It works! Please do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would make the services I now enjoy much more expensive by essentially requiring naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to the care I - along with many others - now receive.

I find it curious that the bill would require MDs to approve naturopathic prescriptions when these remedies are outside an MD's area of study and expertise. As a case in point, despite their knowledge and experience, MDs know very little about nutrition. Yet it's the fulfillment of the body's nutritional needs that ensures the body is functioning properly and keeps people healthy. One wonders how much better health care would be if naturopathic physicians supervised MDs writing prescriptions! I'm sure many prescriptions would be deemed unnecessary and in their place healthier remedies could be substituted. I am not against the practice of "western medicine." It has its place and is certainly necessary for acute situations as I have been in a few of these situations myself. However, I firmly believe that naturopathic medicine can prevent some of these ailments and acute situations from arising.

Unlike the pharmaceuticals prescribed by MDs, naturopathic remedies do not present the patient with undesirable side effects. In my experience, these remedies do not just cover up symptoms, they get to the root cause of ailments because they actually get the body to function as it is supposed to do. Therefore, I feel strongly that a naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when needed, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of health care in our community.

Keeping the cost of naturopathic medical practices down while keeping quality care high is important to the health of many across our state. My naturopathic physician spends 45 minutes to an hour talking with me, assessing how events in my life may be affecting my health, and treating me with acupressure and acupuncture before determining what remedies I need to help me achieve optimal health. Conversely, my MDs typically spend 5 to 10 minutes with me, and I know it is because they must keep volume high to combat the low reimbursements by insurance companies. I pay out of pocket for naturopathic care because insurance companies don't cover it. This limits my ability to get treatment even when I know it works. This bill will make naturopathic care unnecessarily more expensive and therefore make it even more cost prohibitive for me and many others. Why is the Legislature not working on making naturopathic medicine more accessible to all?

The people of Hawaii need health care that actually brings about good health. This bill creates the opposite effect. If SB2577 SD1 is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,
Sandra T. Takeshita

February 17, 2014

RE: PLEASE OPPOSE SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians (Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229)

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

My name is Dr. Nathan Ehrlich, N.D. I am a naturopathic physician practicing in Hawaii on the island of Maui since 1989. I am submitting my testimony to urge you to oppose SB2577 SD1 aimed at over-restricting the practice of Naturopathic medicine in the state. The people of Hawaii showed overwhelming support in granting prescriptive authority to the Naturopathic doctors of this state in 2009 in large part because we as Naturopathic physicians receive rigorous training comparable to Medical doctors and Osteopathic doctors. Our medical training in pharmacology and subsequent clinical training under supervision provides ample education and experience in safely being able to prescribe both natural and pharmaceutical medicines. In our field it is critical to have prescriptive privileges so as to more effectively manage patients who either require weaning off pharmaceutical medicines which are causing more harm than good, or in cases when more gentle and natural medicines are not provide a strong enough physiological effect. We as naturopathic physicians have a history and track record of safety in injection and pharmaceutical therapies and I ask you again to consider this and please oppose SB2577 SD1 .

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Dr. Nathan Ehrlich, N.D.

Chandra Radiance
4-831 Kuhio Hwy Suite 438 # 280
Kapaa, HI 96746

February 17, 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other-Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefited greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to

be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,

Chandra Radiance

Christine Kapololu
180 Lyman Springs Road, Hilo, HI 96720

February 17, 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians
Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229
To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi,
Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and
Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to

oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians. If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am NORA LIZA T. CALEDA. I AM A RESIDENT OF 33-E ONE LEGAZPI PARK 121 RADA ST. MAKATI CITY PHILIPPINES 1229

February 18 , 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

It has been almost 10years when i was diagnosed Stage 2b of Invasive Ductal carcinoma because of the Naturopatic Protocol and Medicines that were given to me by my Naturopathic Dr.Jan Everett who is an Indonesian and practices in Jakarta, Indonesia.

My family and I were based in Jakarta, Indonesia at that time when i was diagnosed of this cancer in 2004. Because i refuse to have chemotherapy due to the horrific after effects that i read and heard of, i opted to go the natural way. There was a great support from my husband and children.

Dr. Jan Everett, a well known Sports Medicine Doctor in Jakarta switched to Naturopathic Medicine when he saw that cancer can be cured this way. I took all the herbal medicines and lifestyle change that he prescribed to me and it's been almost ten years and I am still cancer free.

in 2007, my husband's company moved us to Ho Chi Minh City so i changed to another Naturopathic doctor who was based in the Philippines,Dr.Efren Navarro due to the proximity of Manila to Vietnam compared to Jakarta, Indonesia.

I had my CA125 tumor marker text in November 2013 and it's again negative.

An HCG test done by my Naturopathic doctor just last December had proved once again that i am in remission. And being in remission for the past 10years just means i am cancer free.

Because of this healing, my son, Benjamin Caleda was so inspired and despite having graduated with a degree of Visual Communications from the University of Hawaii 4years ago, he is currently a 3rd year student at the National College of Natural Medicine in Portland, Oregon.

With this, i rest my case and i hope and pray that this bill will not be passed as many like me have the right to the naturopathic way of healing.

Sincerely,
Nora Liza Caleda
+639179043039

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other-Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

For us personally, my husband almost died from mercury poisoning. Five specialist could not find out why his body was shutting down. A nutritionist asked to get him tested for heavy metal toxins. Our primary physician did not feel it was necessary because it was not common. We persisted and blood tests showed high levels of mercury. No physician specializes in chelating so our naturopath is providing this treatment and she specializes in heavy metal toxins. If it was not for our naturopath, my husband would probably be bedridden or worse.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefited greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns

they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Rosie Carrillo
5391 Makaloa Street
Kapaa, HI 96746

Testimony in Opposition of SB2577, SD1, Relating to Naturopathic Physicians
Senate Committees on Commerce & Consumer Protection
Mon., February 17, 2014; 10:30 a.m., Conference Room 229

To: The Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair
The Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair
Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577, SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577, SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the U.S. for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs' review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the Board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the

patient, not when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577, SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577, SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577, SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,
Charlotte Hee

Cale Rocco 8082765030 po box 12105 Lahaina hi 96761
February , 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, not when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and

review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you, Cale Rocco
Sent from my iPhone

To Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to voice my strong objection to SB2577 SD1. The Legislature received well over 300 emails opposing SB2577, and only three in support. Yet the Committee Report (SB2577 SD1 SSCR2244) seemed to ignore this, stating that the committee only "received testimony in opposition to this measure from Sakoda Construction, LLC, and several individuals." Why was a second hearing scheduled when there were such overwhelming opposition to this bill?

Naturopathic physicians already receive extensive medical training that more than qualifies them for their current prescription privileges. The hours of pharmacology training naturopathic physicians receive are nearly the same as that of MDs. To insure that Hawaii's naturopathic physicians are current and up-to-date they have recommend that they complete 15 hours of continuing education bi-annually in pharmacology.

This bill would require naturopathic physicians to submit monthly reports to the board detailing every single item they prescribe and require the board to report this data to the legislature annually. Why are we requiring this of naturopathic physicians when no corresponding requirement is placed on other types of physicians. Isn't this impractical and cumbersome?

I see no logical reason why naturopathic physicians should be singled out for any of the excesses of SB2577 SD1. SB2577 SD1 is a highly regressive proposal reflecting a failure to honor and understand an entire profession. Many of our very best primary care doctors are naturopathic doctors. We need them. They add another dimension to our medical needs. It appears that Medical Doctors do not want to level the playing field.

Thank you for your consideration of my testimony in strong opposition to this bill.

Clifford Fujii
572 Kapaia St
Honolulu, HI 96825

Leslie Ann Ciufu
95096 Lokih Street
Millilani, HI 96789
February 17, 2014

My Position: Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians
To Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to voice very strong objections to SB2577 SD1. I have seen naturopathic physicians for over 30 years in the state of Hawaii. I have had continued rashes and allergies that haven't been helped by regular doctors. They have only prescribed steroids, whereas naturopathic doctors have always treated the underlying cause of my condition. I have also been helped by the prescription rights that naturopathic physicians have had as part of their licensure in the state of Hawaii. They have helped me with the hormonal transition of menopause by giving me bio-identical hormones, and natural herbs. I am allergic to many medications but the medicines that my naturopathic doctors have given me I've been able to tolerate. My doctors have always done the research needed to best address my health conditions.

Please oppose this bill and keep our naturopathic formulary law intact.

Sincerely,
Leslie Ann Ciufu
#808-625-5426

February 175, 2014

My Position: Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

To Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to voice very strong objections to SB2577 SD1. The Legislature received well over 300 emails opposing SB2577, and only three in support, yet the Committee Report (SB2577 SD1 SSCR2244) seemed to ignore this, stating only that the committee "received testimony in opposition to this measure from Sakoda Construction, LLC, and several individuals." Why was a second hearing scheduled when there was such overwhelming opposition to this bill?

SB2577 SD1 would require naturopathic physicians to unreasonably reduce their current prescription rights - integral to their services - and add unfair burdens to their practices. This bill is illogical, unnecessary, and clearly biased against the naturopathic profession. It seems intended to foster conflict rather than cooperation in Hawaii's integrative health care community, and it's based on faulty assumptions about the education of naturopathic physicians. For example, the Committee Report incorrectly states that the education of naturopathic physicians "offers very few contact hours of study on pharmacological treatment of disease." In fact, the hours of pharmacology training for naturopathic physicians are nearly the same as that of MDs, and greater than that of osteopaths (DOs).

There are so many problems with this bill that adequately describing them all would require dozens of pages of testimony. The following is a brief summary, beginning with its most egregious flaws.

First, this bill essentially proposes that naturopathic physicians, in order to continue qualifying for the prescription privileges the legislature wisely granted them (with overwhelming public support) years ago, would be required to have MDs "review" all of their prescriptions. According to the bill, these MDs would then "address any concerns" with these prescriptions, including the actual amounts prescribed, to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is worse than illogical, because:

1. The training of MDs does not at all qualify them for such a role. Allopathic education, compared to naturopathic education, has far fewer standards and requirements for training in the use of natural and preventive treatment modalities. SB2577 SD1 reflects a misunderstanding of, or a disregard for, what a naturopathic physician is. The entire point of naturopathic physician's education and training is to become a distinctly different type of medical expert than an MD - one who is highly educated in an alternative system of medicine that differs in many ways from that of conventional allopathic physicians. MDs are not equipped by their training to provide a meaningful review of naturopathic prescriptions, or have a comprehensive understanding of the complex issues they involve. (In an attempt to defend the bill, the Committee Report states that "naturopathic education differs from that received within allopathic or osteopathic medical schools." You cannot have it both ways; if the training is different, then it makes no sense for MDs to review naturopathic prescriptions.)

2. The extensive medical training of naturopathic physicians already more than qualifies them for their current prescription privileges.

3. Such a proposal is conspicuously one-sided and unfair. Is a corresponding requirement placed on MDs and other health care providers? Should MDs be required to have naturopathic physicians review and monitor all of their prescription activities, since the training of naturopathic physicians is much more extensive in many important areas (particularly those pertaining to a broad range of natural and preventive treatments) than that of MDs?

4. Appointing one type of physician to “oversee” another’s jurisdiction raises all manner of legal and ethical concerns. It would be terrible public policy to require one kind of doctor to answer to another kind of doctor, trained in a different form of medicine, in order to simply maintain the prescription rights they were trained to have, especially when other types of doctors enjoy corresponding rights with no such requirement. Some have questioned whether a proposal of this kind may be unconstitutional and discriminatory. It would also be highly impractical, as it raises numerous dilemmas regarding patient rights, insurance issues, patient confidentiality, and more. Second, this bill would require naturopathic physicians to submit monthly reports to the board detailing every single item they prescribe, and require the board to report this data to the legislature annually. Again, this is blatantly unfair, since no corresponding requirement is placed on other types of physicians. It is also impractical and cumbersome: it would place a completely unnecessary burden of paperwork on many of our most valuable primary care physicians - which Hawaii already has a shortage of. And SB2577 SD1 would further hinder the prescription process by requiring naturopathic physicians to receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item on their own formulary.

Last but not least objectionable, SB2577 SD1 would also place inappropriate and unreasonable limits on the naturopathic formulary by excluding such current prescription items as certain injectable medicines, vaccines, and medical oxygen.

There’s no logical reason why naturopathic physicians should be singled out for any of the above-mentioned excesses of SB2577 SD1. To the contrary, since naturopathic physicians received prescriptive authority nearly five years ago, no evidence of patient harm regarding their prescription rights has been brought to the board, and there has been no overuse of prescriptive authority and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. In addition, the public has benefited enormously as a result of the current prescriptive rights of naturopathic physicians; countless people have improved their health, and the public continues to overwhelmingly support those rights. Furthermore, in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights there’s no precedent for such restrictive requirements as those proposed in SB2577 SD1. In fact, the Hawaii board has already adopted standards of practice, care, competency, and safety for naturopathic physicians that are among the most rigorous in the nation. Hawaii’s naturopathic physicians have even gone so far as to voluntarily recommend that they complete 15 hours of continuing education bi-annually in pharmacology. (By the way, this is the ONLY portion of SB2577 SD1 that is reasonable and should be proposed.)

SB2577 SD1 is a highly regressive proposal reflecting a failure to honor and understand an entire profession. It would reverse many positive gains that naturopathic physicians have rightfully achieved, and by reducing the effectiveness of many of our very best primary care doctors, have numerous negative consequences for the people of Hawaii. Thank you for your consideration of my testimony in strong opposition to this bill.

Sincerely,

Laura Glenn

Date: 2/17/14

To Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair; Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on commerce and Consumer Protection:

I am writing to vehemently oppose SB2577 SD1. I do not wish to give up the quality of life that I now have, thanks to the naturopath who oversees my health care. Over the years I have had many health issues that could not be improved or diagnosed by regular medical doctors. I've worked in the medical field my entire career (over 40 years), but had no exposure to alternative medicine until 2005. At that time I had my first acupuncture treatment to relieve pain that my gastroenterologist was unable to manage. With the success of a few treatments, I became more open to natural and alternative forms of health care. I now believe more than ever that it's your duty to support our naturopath's and not limit the scope of their ability to help meet our health care needs.

In 2007, I sought treatment from a licensed naturopath in Honolulu. I was suffering from the effects of menopause, and although I had seen many gynecologists, my symptoms were worsening. Due to my family medical history I felt I was not a candidate for conventional hormone replacement therapy. I was unable to use topical prescriptions from the gynecologist due to chemical sensitivities. Sleepless nights, discomfort, hot flashes, and other symptoms were not alleviated with what little my gynecologist could offer. I wished I had made an appointment with the naturopath years earlier. She was able to prescribe medication from a compounding pharmacy and also sell me some natural products that would relieve many of my symptoms without increased HRT risk. I wish now that I had made that appointment years earlier. It would have eliminated needless suffering.

Once I had established a doctor/patient relationship with my naturopath, we later explored my ongoing G.I. concerns. She found that many of the gastrointestinal symptoms that I had suffered with for years was related to food sensitivities. I was in severe pain in 2005 and I had undergone numerous invasive procedures such as a colonoscopy and multiple CT scans, lab tests, an ultrasound, etc. The gastroenterologist could not explain my pain and just wanted me to take some prescription drugs, even though there was no evidence of what was causing the pain. So I continued to have abdominal pain, belly sensitivity, headaches, agitation, and constipation. My naturopath ordered a laboratory test that showed I was sensitive to many of the foods I was eating. Once we identified which foods to avoid (i.e. eggs, dairy, whole wheat, etc.), I changed my diet and was feeling 100% better in about a week's time. Year's of suffering remedied in a week!

I've also been under the care of a neurologist for many years due to headaches. My headaches have also improved tremendously since changing my diet. It's amazing how many appointments and how much money my insurance has paid to doctors that could not find the cause of my health problems. My naturopath has been able to improve my health and happiness tremendously. Because of these good outcomes, I consider her my Primary Care Doctor, even though I also see an Internist due to health insurance considerations.

This past year, I had some new health issues to deal with. It took a coordinated effort to get me back on the right track, but once again it was my naturopath that found the cause and treatment that brought my

body back into balance. I sought care from a gynecologist, uro-gynecologist, and internist. I was having severe abdominal pain and bloating, urinary frequency, burning sensations, multiple urinary tract infections, etc. I was in so much pain that my internist prescribed Vicodin (I've only taken Vicodin on one other occasion, 20 years ago, after a shoulder surgery). After exhaustive testing that included ultrasounds, a vaginal biopsy, cystoscopy, and yet another CT scan prescribed by the other doctors, my naturopath suggested I had the symptoms of small intestinal bacterial overgrowth. She ordered a test that came back highly positive, and she suggested that I needed a course of antibiotics specific to this condition. I had already been on Cipro twice and Bactrim, prescribed by the other physicians. By taking the antibiotics she recommended, as well as following a restricted diet, the abdominal pain and bloating subsided. She also prescribed some additional medications from the compounding pharmacy and advised I drink a specific tea to help ease my bladder symptoms. The uro-gynecologist wanted to do invasive and expensive bladder instillations, which were not needed by following the advice of my naturopath.

My naturopath also keeps me healthy in other ways that traditional western medical doctors do not. She's worked on building and strengthening my immunity. I've had a couple of Myer's IV's to protect me during airline flights when so many people were contracting airborne illnesses. When I'm exposed to people with colds and flu, I don't seem to take ill, even though my friends and family succumb. My naturopath would not prescribe an antibiotic unless it was absolutely necessary because there are alternatives that most western doctors aren't even aware of. Very good practice in this age of "super bugs" caused by over prescribing antibiotics.

I'm very thankful for the care I've been given by my naturopath. I feel 20 years younger than my actual age. I'm not sure why this senate bill was introduced. It seems that the legislature took the right action in 2009 when they gave the naturopath's the authority to do their job and prescribe if necessary. I ask you to join me and oppose this bill that would be detrimental to the health of so many of your constituents.

Respectfully,

Suzanne Walker

3008 Libert St.

Honolulu, HI. 96816

Mark Vincent

Office Manager

Hilo Natural Health Clinic

152 Pu'ueo Street

Hilo, HI 96720

February 17, 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently

provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,

Mark Vincent

February 17 , 2014

From: Marie Sode, 369 Kaimake Loop, Kailua 96734

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it.

I have enjoyed the assistance of a naturopathic doctor for over 20 years. There is a time and place for such services and stringent qualifications and these have coincided with the care of physicians that I have had as well.

Please be informed before you make your decision. Do not assume you already know what's right. Stand up to the physicians who feel threatened.

Aloha.....

I strongly oppose SB2577SD1. Please do not Pass this bill.

mahalo.....Danielle Chomel

Sent from my iPad

Sandra Lee P.O. Box 1511 Kurtistown, HI 96760

February 17, 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you, Sandra Lee

Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

Thurs, 2/20/14 at 10:30am in Rm 229

Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair,
Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and Distinguished
Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce & Consumer Protection:

Dear Hon. Sen. Baker, Taniguchi & Committee on Commerce & Consumer Protection:

I'm a naturopathic physician (ND) and I strongly oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would require all NDs to practice under the review of a MD, whether said NDs are prescribing a hormone, a vitamin, a herbal supplement or an antibiotic.

While I agree that integrative medicine is an excellent approach for most patients, I think both NDs and MDs should have the option to choose when they collaborate with other professionals. NDs are primary care physicians in Hawaii and do not need to be reviewed by MDs.

This bill requires NDs to acquire 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacy annually. While I support the intent of this requirement, I disagree with the content. MDs in Hawaii are only required to take a total of 20 hours of continuing education annually. To help you understand the difference, at a conference that I attend annually, MDs are eligible to receive 21 to 27 hours, of which only about 5 are pharmacy hours. Thus a Hawaii MD attending the conference would more than fully satisfy their annual CE requirement, while a Hawaii ND would only satisfy 1/3 of their CE requirement.

NDs, like MDs, take the Hippocratic oath to practice ethically and to always consider the patient safety – to “first do no harm”. While the current naturopathic formulary is quite broad, NDs, like MDs, will not prescribe anything that they consider to be outside of their specific training, scope of practice and comfort. 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. There have not been any complaints brought to the Hawaii State Naturopathic Board regarding prescriptive authority; no cases of NDs using prescriptions outside their training and scope of practice; and no lawsuits filed in this regard. Thus, there is no need for SB2577 SD1. Please defer this bill.

Thank you,
Darrow Hand, ND

I am Sheila Sumida / 46-298 Kalali St., Kaneohe, HI. 96744, a patient of a naturopath.

I strongly OPPOSE the above bill. The bill is unnecessary and a setback to those individuals who choose to be treated by a naturopath. I elected to be treated by a naturopath because I've suffered with a persistent urinary tract infection for the past 20+ years. However, in the recent 3 years, due to the MDs prescription of antibiotics, the bacteria is resistant to many of the current antibiotics. Moreover, a particular antibiotic prescribed to me has a deleterious affect causing scarring of the lung tissues.

The current law in effect works well. There has not been any adverse affect to patients and the Naturopath doctor can work within those regulations.

Please OPPOSE SC2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I demand.

Sheila Sumida

76-156 Kamehamalu St.

Kailua Kona, HI 96740

February 17, 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

SB2577 SD1 requires your Naturopathic Physician to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If SB2577 SD1 is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians.

Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,

Candace J. Hallett

Marlene Celinski,

P.O. Box 403,

Kealahou, HI. 96750

February 17, 2014

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in

SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

SB2577 SD1 requires your Naturopathic Physician to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board,

the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If SB2577 SD1 is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians.

Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,

Marlene Celinski

Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,

Marcy Strate
marcys@hawaii.rr.com

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal.

Anaturopathic

physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit

detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,
Sheela Sharma

Zelin

P.O. Box 6944,

Kamuela, HI

96743

February 17, 2014

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in

SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

SB2577 SD1 requires your Naturopathic Physician to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board,

the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If SB2577 SD1 is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians.

Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,

Dharmani Zelin

SB2577

Submitted on: 2/17/2014

Testimony for CPN on Feb 20, 2014 10:30AM in Conference Room 229

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Bonnie Marsh	Individual	Oppose	No

Comments: I oppose SB2577 as a licensed Naturopathic Doctor practicing on the island of Maui. My first question is why are Naturopath's being targeted to restrict their ability to practice within the scope of their education? My experience with the prescribing of medications, giving IV Nutrients and prescribing Bio-Identical Hormones is that my patient's receive many health advantages that they are all included in my licensing and educational background. I have never had a complaint, adverse reaction reported or any legal action taken against me within my practice. I support continuing education in pharmaceutical's for ND's. When i received licensing in Hawaii, I did ask why both my ND license and RN license did not require CEU's for relicensing. The answer from the two state boards, was that it was not proven that they were beneficial. The idea of bringing ND's under the supervision of a Medical Doctor in relation to pharmaceutical prescribing, is truly a misguided idea. Naturopathic Doctors are classified as Primary Care Physicians by Insurance Companies in Hawaii at this time and under the new Obama Health initiative. I ask for your respect and acknowledgement of our Educational training and knowledge of medicine. Mahalo for taking the time to consider my testimony and please leave the door open for the citizens of Hawaii to receive full care through me. Including keeping the law as it is which supports the full extent of our training. Dr. Bonnie Marsh

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

This should not even be a question, or an issue. Naturopathic doctors are licensed to practice. Let's discuss the number one cause of death...AMA doctors. Maybe they should be monitored by naturopathic doctors. Thank you for defending our right to choose natural medicine. With Aloha, Aerie Waters

I strongly appose the Bill that is trying to stop my Naturopathic Doctor from writing prescriptions. I ask that you please not support this bill.

Thank you,
Laurel Campbell

Sent from my iPhone

Leann Martin
PO Box 62268
Honolulu, Hawaii 96839

February 17, 2014

My Position: Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

To Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to voice very strong objections to SB2577 SD1. Thank you for your consideration of my testimony in strong opposition to this bill. I have complete trust in my naturopathic physicians and their abilities to make decisions using their extensive training. I personally have found relief from pain and other issues with their help that I was unable to find from other medical professionals. Often I am unable to get an appointment with my primary care doctor in a timely manner, but my naturopathic physicians are always willing to see me and recommend solutions, whether it is through them or other medical professionals. Please do not limit what these highly educated professionals have to offer us!

The Legislature received well over 300 emails opposing SB2577, and only three in support, yet the Committee Report (SB2577 SD1 SSCR2244) seemed to ignore this, stating only that the committee "received testimony in opposition to this measure from Sakoda Construction, LLC, and several individuals." Why was a second hearing scheduled when there was such overwhelming opposition to this bill?

SB2577 SD1 would require naturopathic physicians to unreasonably reduce their current prescription rights - integral to their services - and add unfair burdens to their practices. This bill is illogical, unnecessary, and clearly biased against the naturopathic profession. It seems intended to foster conflict rather than cooperation in Hawaii's integrative health care community, and it's based on faulty assumptions about the education of naturopathic physicians. For example, the Committee Report incorrectly states that the education of naturopathic physicians "offers very few contact hours of study on pharmacological treatment of disease." In fact, the hours of pharmacology training for naturopathic physicians are nearly the same as that of MDs, and greater than that of osteopaths.

February 17, 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I humbly ask that you oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill places unnecessary and overly burdensome restrictions on naturopathic doctors prescription rights.

I have finally found a doctor who cares, who listens, who searches until she finds an answer to the problem. Please don't hamstring her ability to treat me by letting this unreasonable and unnecessary bill pass!

Mahalo for your time and consideration,

Robbyn Peck
952 Kupulau Rd.
Hilo HI 96720

I am writing in support of my Naturapathic Doctor and in opposition to bill SB2577SD1.

Please allow these skilled and experienced Doctors to continue to practice and use their full knowledge to take care of us.

Thank you
Ane Takaha
Maui

Dr Sir or Ma'am,

I am a patient of Dr Laurie Steelsmith and would like to continue seeing her as my primary care doc. She has been adequately trained to handle my needs and if she is not she can and has with great results, referred me to a qualified MD. It is good to have a doctor that will work with you using natural methods for some things and medicines when needed. Do not take her right to prescribe away or be hindered by constant oversight which will also affect the MDs and their care by taking their time away from their patients.

Thank you,

Cynthia Lebowitz

Honolulu, HI

Karis Tressel, ND
930 Olive Drive
Bakersfield CA 93308

February 15, 2014

My Position: Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians
To Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members
of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I have recently become aware of SB2577 SD1's being granted a second hearing and am writing to voice my strong objection. As a licensed and practicing naturopathic doctor in the state of California, where the current practice scope more closely resembles that of SB2577 SD1 than Hawaii's current law, I can confidently say SB2577 SD1 will hinder patient care. Disallowing a doctor to practice within the scope of his or her training denies your citizens access to the quality of care they deserve.

I have pasted below an email I am sure you have seen before, because I fully agree with its contents. However, I would like to leave you with these wise words from Mark Twain.

"How is it that there are a thousand ways in which I may be permitted to damn my soul, but when it comes to a trivial matter like temporary ill health, the Legislature must prescribe how I shall do it. It is absurd and ridiculous." Although I do not disagree with legislative involvement in medical and naturopathic licensing, Twain has a point!

I trust you will not proceed with your decision about this bill lightly.

SB2577 SD1 would require naturopathic physicians to unreasonably reduce their current prescription rights - integral to their services - and add unfair burdens to their practices. This bill is illogical, unnecessary, and clearly biased against the naturopathic profession. It seems intended to foster conflict rather than cooperation in Hawaii's integrative health care community, and it's based on faulty assumptions about the education of naturopathic physicians. For example, the Committee Report incorrectly states that the education of naturopathic physicians "offers very few contact hours of study on pharmacological treatment of disease." In fact, the hours of pharmacology training for naturopathic physicians are nearly the same as that of MDs, and greater than that of osteopaths.

There are so many problems with this bill that adequately describing them all would require dozens of pages of testimony. The following is a brief summary, beginning with its most egregious flaws.

First, this bill essentially proposes that naturopathic physicians, in order to continue qualifying for the prescription privileges the legislature wisely granted them (with overwhelming public support) years ago, would be required to have MDs "review" all of their prescriptions. According to the bill, these MDs would then "address any concerns" with these prescriptions, including the actual amounts prescribed, to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is worse than illogical, because:

1. The training of MDs does not at all qualify them for such a role. Allopathic education, compared to naturopathic education, has far fewer standards and requirements for training in the use of natural and preventive treatment modalities. SB2577 SD1 reflects a misunderstanding of, or a disregard for, what a naturopathic physician is. The entire point of naturopathic physician's education and training is to become a distinctly different type of medical expert than an MD - one who is highly educated in an alternative system of medicine that differs in many ways from that of conventional allopathic physicians. MDs are not equipped by their training to provide a meaningful review of naturopathic prescriptions, or have a comprehensive

understanding of the complex issues they involve. (In an attempt to defend the bill, the Committee Report states that “naturopathic education differs from that received within allopathic or osteopathic medical schools.” You cannot have it both ways; if the training is different, then it makes no sense for MDs to review naturopathic prescriptions.)

2. The extensive medical training of naturopathic physicians already more than qualifies them for their current prescription privileges.

3. Such a proposal is conspicuously one-sided and unfair. Is a corresponding requirement placed on MDs and other health care providers? Should MDs be required to have naturopathic physicians review and monitor all of their prescription activities, since the training of naturopathic physicians is much more extensive in many important areas (particularly those pertaining to a broad range of natural and preventive treatments) than that of MDs?

4. Appointing one type of physician to “oversee” another’s jurisdiction raises all manner of legal and ethical concerns. It would be terrible public policy to require one kind of doctor to answer to another kind of doctor, trained in a different form of medicine, in order to simply maintain the prescription rights they were trained to have, especially when other types of doctors enjoy corresponding rights with no such requirement. Some have questioned whether a proposal of this kind may be unconstitutional and discriminatory. It would also be highly impractical, as it raises numerous dilemmas regarding patient rights, insurance issues, patient confidentiality, and more.

Second, this bill would require naturopathic physicians to submit monthly reports to the board detailing every single item they prescribe, and require the board to report this data to the legislature annually. Again, this is blatantly unfair, since no corresponding requirement is placed on other types of physicians. It is also impractical and cumbersome: it would place a completely unnecessary burden of paperwork on many of our most valuable primary care physicians - which Hawaii already has a shortage of. And SB2577 SD1 would further hinder the prescription process by requiring naturopathic physicians to receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item on their own formulary.

Last but not least objectionable, SB2577 SD1 would also place inappropriate and unreasonable limits on the naturopathic formulary by excluding such current prescription items as certain injectable medicines, vaccines, and medical oxygen.

There’s no logical reason why naturopathic physicians should be singled out for any of the above-mentioned excesses of SB2577 SD1. To the contrary, since naturopathic physicians received prescriptive authority nearly five years ago, no evidence of patient harm regarding their prescription rights has been brought to the board, and there has been no overuse of prescriptive authority and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. In addition, the public has benefitted enormously as a result of the current prescriptive rights of naturopathic physicians; countless people have improved their health, and the public continues to overwhelmingly support those rights. Furthermore, in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights there’s no precedent for such restrictive requirements as those proposed in SB2577 SD1. In fact, the Hawaii board has already adopted standards of practice, care, competency, and safety for naturopathic physicians that are among the most rigorous in the nation. Hawaii’s naturopathic physicians have even gone so far as to voluntarily recommend that they complete 15 hours of continuing education bi-annually in pharmacology. (By the way, this is the ONLY portion of SB2577 SD1 that is reasonable and should be proposed.)

SB2577 SD1 is a highly regressive proposal reflecting a failure to honor and understand an entire profession. It would reverse many positive gains that naturopathic physicians have rightfully achieved, and by reducing the effectiveness of many of our very best primary care doctors, have numerous negative consequences for the people of Hawaii. Thank you for your consideration of my testimony in strong opposition to this bill.

Sincerely,

Karis Tressel

Janet Krumpe, 1367 Lower Kimo, Kula, HI 96790

February 17, 2014

Position: Strong Opposition to SB2577 SD1 Relating to Naturopathic Physicians

Hearing at 10:30 am on February 20th, 2014 in Conference Room 229

To the Honorable Senator Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair, the Honorable Senator Brian T. Taniguchi, Vice Chair, and other Distinguished Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection:

I'm writing to request that you do everything in your power to oppose SB2577 SD1. This bill would essentially require naturopathic physicians to restrict or give up prescription rights that are essential to their services. My naturopathic doctor's ability to write certain prescriptions when I need them, without the unreasonable restrictions proposed by SB2577 SD1, is an important part of my health care.

There's no good reason for this bill, and every reason to oppose it. Since the Legislature rightfully granted Hawaii's naturopathic physicians prescriptive authority almost five years ago, there has been no evidence whatsoever of patient harm pertaining to these prescription rights brought to the naturopathic Board. There has also been no overuse of prescriptive authority, no cases of naturopathic physicians using it outside their training and scope of practice, and not one lawsuit filed in this regard. Instead, the public has benefitted greatly from this prescriptive authority. The training of naturopathic physicians sufficiently prepares them for their prescription privileges, and they are highly qualified to offer all the services they currently provide, to the full extent of their licensed scope of practice, which is well defined. Standards of care have recently been adopted by the Board that provide oversight and clear criteria for the practice of naturopathic medicine in Hawaii. The restrictive requirements in SB2577 SD1 have no precedent in other states where naturopathic physicians have prescriptive rights. Furthermore, the Hawaii naturopathic Board has set some of the highest standards in the US for the practice, safety, and competence of naturopathic physicians. Hawaii's naturopathic physicians have even taken the unusual step of voluntarily recommending that they complete 15 hours of continuing education in pharmacology biennially.

One of the more misguided aspects of this bill is the proposal that naturopathic physicians would be required to have MDs review all of their prescriptions, including the amounts prescribed, and that these MDs would address any concerns they have with these prescriptions to the naturopathic physician and the board. This is an extremely ill-conceived proposal. A naturopathic physician is a very different type of medical expert than an MD. With all due respect, MDs are not at all equipped to make sensible reviews of naturopathic prescriptions, because their education has few, if any, requirements for training in the use of naturopathic treatment modalities. The education of my naturopathic physician far exceeded that of any MD in many areas essential to my health care. Naturopathic doctors are highly trained to be independent providers who consult with other health professionals when they consider it appropriate for the patient, *not* when required by law to subordinate their expertise to individuals untrained in naturopathic medicine. In addition, requiring one type of doctor to oversee and review a very different type of doctor's practice would create endless implementation and legal problems when it comes to issues such as insurance, patient privacy, HIPAA laws, and much more.

SB2577 SD1 would also hinder naturopathic physicians and reduce their effectiveness by placing other unnecessary, inappropriate, and impractical burdens on their practices. These include the requirement that they submit detailed monthly reports of each item they prescribe to the board, the requirement that they receive authorization from the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs in order to prescribe any item from their own formulary, and the requirement that certain important prescription items, such as vaccines, medical oxygen, and some injectable medicines, be excluded from the naturopathic formulary. In some cases, requirements that SB2577 SD1 would impose seem blatantly unfair, and may even be discriminatory, because no comparable requirements are placed on other types of physicians.

If this bill is not stopped, it will undermine the high standards that the people of Hawaii have come to expect from naturopathic physicians. It will also reduce the quality of naturopathic care and the effectiveness of some of our most valued primary care providers, at a time when primary care physicians are already in short supply. The last thing we need is to turn back the clock on the prescriptive abilities of our naturopathic physicians. Please oppose SB2577 SD1 and protect my access to the high level of naturopathic care that I deserve.

Thank you,
Janet Krumpe