

1 Medical Exemptions to Vaccination — Riverside County, California, 2016–2019.

2 Cameron Kaiser, MD, MPH¹ (CK); Tonya Geiger, MSN¹ (TG); Cassandra Lynch¹ (CL); Anna Rivera¹
3 (AR)

4 1. Riverside County Department of Public Health, Riverside, CA.

5

6 Corresponding author: C. Kaiser, MD, MPH, ckaiser.md@gmail.com

7

8 **Abstract**

9 **Objectives.** To review the nature and clinical reasoning of medical exemptions to vaccination
10 received in Riverside County, CA after California Senate Bill 277 eliminated personal belief
11 exemptions statewide.

12

13 **Methods.** 614 deduplicated medical exemptions to vaccination from 156 providers were
14 reviewed from August 2016 to August 2019. Exemptions covering all vaccines were additionally
15 coded for number and category of medical justification.

16

17 **Results.** 81.3% of reviewed exemptions were for all vaccines, 91.0% were permanent or
18 indefinite, and 74.9% were for all vaccines and permanent or indefinite. Of the 490 evaluated
19 all-vaccine exemptions, a median of two and maximum of ten justifications were cited per
20 exemption, most often a family history of autoimmune disease other than allergy. Three
21 providers wrote more than 70 exemptions each.

22

23 **Conclusions.** The number and nature of the exemptions reviewed here raise concerns over their
24 impact on immunization rates, and future policies may need to ensure additional oversight.

25

26 **Introduction**

1 On July 1, 2016, California Senate Bill (SB) 277 eliminated personal belief exemptions to
2 vaccination requirements for school and day care entry, and expanded the definition of medical
3 vaccination exemptions to allow consideration of family history instead of only the student's
4 medical history (1). At the time of passage a medical exemption consisted of a licensed
5 physician's statement listing exempted vaccines and duration; neither specific reasoning nor
6 renewal was required (1). Although exemptions overall decreased after SB 277's passage,
7 medical exemptions increased statewide (2,3,4,5,6,7), including a modest increase in Riverside
8 County (4), California's fourth largest county with over 2.4 million residents (8). To evaluate the
9 number and characteristics of medical exemptions after passage of SB 277, we conducted a
10 study during August 2016–August 2019 of exemptions submitted to Riverside County
11 educational institutions subject to the new requirements.

12

13 **Methods**

14 Medical exemptions and grandfathered personal belief exemptions received for kindergarten
15 and 7th grade entry and school transfers were sent from participating educational institutions
16 by secure fax. Students' names and identifying personal information were redacted in
17 compliance with applicable state law and the federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act
18 (FERPA). Duplicates were eliminated by comparing any school-assigned tracking numbers, letter
19 date, provider name, justifications, and the document's appearance, wording, or distinguishing
20 marks.

21 Once records were deduplicated, the exemption date and the issuing provider's name
22 were recorded, along with a notation of whether the exemption was a grandfathered personal
23 belief exemption or a current medical exemption. All exemptions submitted by schools during
24 the study period were accepted for analysis, including those dated prior to it. Grandfathered
25 personal belief exemptions were tallied and not further analyzed. Among medical exemptions,
26 the following were documented: 1) whether the issuing provider was in the six-county
27 (Riverside, San Bernardino, Los Angeles, Orange, San Diego and Imperial) region (defined as
28 local), 2) whether the exemption was permanent or indefinite; and 3) whether the exemption
29 covered all vaccines or a subset. These six counties were defined as local to avoid falsely

1 labeling exemptions as out of the area for students receiving care at pediatric specialty
2 hospitals in those jurisdictions; because students were not identified, their primary care
3 providers therefore could not be known.

4 An exemption was considered permanent or indefinite if no expiry date was written, the
5 provider explicitly declined to provide an end date, the letter explicitly indicated the exemption
6 was permanent, or the provider indicated that the exemption was in force until the student's
7 18th birthday, as no school-required vaccinations would likely be administered after that time.
8 An exemption was considered to cover potentially all vaccines if the provider explicitly wrote all
9 vaccines were exempted, the provider used a checkbox form with required California
10 immunizations and checked all listed vaccines, or the provider listed all subsequent required
11 immunizations as being exempt.

12 Medical exemptions that appeared to cover all vaccines were reviewed by the county
13 public health officer, a licensed family physician certified by the American Board of Family
14 Medicine, who hand-coded justifications cited in the exemptions for analysis. Justifications
15 were grouped where appropriate based on number and specificity of the condition(s).

16 At the study's conclusion, all records of exemptions, intermediate work products, and
17 associated documentation were securely destroyed. The study design and protocol were
18 reviewed with the county health system Institutional Review Board (IRB), who determined IRB
19 approval was not required.

20

21 **Results**

22 Overall, 645 exemptions to vaccination were received during the study period; 31 were
23 grandfathered personal belief exemptions, and 614 were medical exemptions. All 614 medical
24 exemptions came from 156 providers, with 147 (94.2%) writing fewer than ten exemptions
25 each and three (1.9%) writing more than 70 each (Table 1).

26 606 (98.7%) of the 614 medical exemptions were written by licensed physicians, with
27 five by nurse practitioners, two by registered nurses, and one by a chiropractor. 478 (77.9%) of
28 the medical exemptions were written by 103 providers (66.0%) outside of Riverside county, 453
29 (73.8%) were written by 65 providers (41.7%) outside of Riverside and San Bernardino counties,

1 and 77 (12.5%) were written by 18 providers (11.5%) outside of all six counties. 131 (21.3%) of
2 the medical exemptions were dated before the study start of August 2016. The highest
3 individual school year count was 204 medical exemptions during the 2017-18 school year
4 (Figure).

5 Overall, 499 (81.3%) medical exemptions were for all vaccines, 559 (91.0%) were
6 permanent or indefinite, and 460 (74.9%) were for all vaccines and were permanent or
7 indefinite. Among the 499 exemptions for all vaccines, 490 exemptions (98.2%) were reviewed
8 for justifications with nine discarded for illegibility. Nineteen (3.9%) of the 490 all-vaccine
9 exemptions cited no justification for the exemption; all nineteen had no expiration date. The
10 471 exemptions containing justifications cited an average of 2.8 justifications per exemption,
11 with a median of 2 and a maximum of 10 (Table 2). The most commonly cited justifications
12 were family history of autoimmune disease other than allergy (263, 55.8%), family history of
13 vaccine reaction (189, 40.1%), and history of vaccine reaction in the student (169, 35.9%).
14 Autism spectrum disorder was cited in 37 (7.9%), with 22 asserting family history of autism
15 spectrum disorder placing the student at risk, rather than history of autism spectrum disorder
16 in the student. Overall, 152 (32.3%) of the 470 coded all-vaccine exemptions entirely cited
17 family history and none of the student's medical history.

18

19 **Discussion**

20 This study shows a large increase in local medical exemption prevalence after passage of SB
21 277, consistent with state data showing a doubling of medical exemptions in the 2016-17
22 school year compared to 2015-16 (2,3), particularly in private schools, and continuing to
23 increase through at least 2020 (5,6,7). Although legitimate contraindications exist for specific
24 vaccinations (9), particular attention was paid to medical exemptions excluding all vaccines as
25 there would rarely be a reason for all vaccines to be contraindicated (9,10) yet such exemptions
26 were the majority of those received. Additionally, concern arises with the proportion of all-
27 vaccine exemptions citing only family history, which has very few specific contraindications in
28 the ACIP guidelines (10).

1 Because of anecdotal reports that some out-of-area providers publicly indicated
2 willingness to write medical exemptions, non-local providers were also counted separately. The
3 proportion of non-local providers who wrote medical exemptions may indicate at least some
4 travel to providers outside the local area was undertaken to obtain them.

5 It is not known precisely what proportion of issued medical exemptions in Riverside
6 County was actually collected by this study. Since identifying information was redacted, it is
7 unknown if multiple exemptions covered the same student in multiple years, although this is
8 not believed to be a significant factor as renewal was not required for permanent exemptions
9 at the time of the study. School participation was voluntary, and some private schools did not
10 submit any exemptions. Many exemptions contained directions forbidding disclosure to third
11 parties; while neither California nor federal law prohibits health departments from obtaining
12 deidentified information on vaccine exemptions, it is unclear how many were not sent to the
13 health department because of such notations. It is also not known how many exemptions were
14 subsequently rejected by schools for other reasons, although it is believed the vast majority
15 remain in effect.

16 The study was concluded due to the imminent passage of California Senate Bills 276 and
17 714, both signed on September 9, 2019, which require periodic renewal of all medical
18 exemptions, enable them to be revoked under certain conditions, and require them to be
19 submitted to a central database. The bills also continue to permit medical exemptions outside
20 of ACIP guidelines, including those based on family history, and allow revocations to be
21 appealed (11,12).

22 Despite the bills' passage, the California Department of Public Health reported in
23 response to a media inquiry that as of October 2021 only 6% of medical exemptions were
24 rejected statewide under these statutes (13). It is possible the new laws and other related
25 enforcement actions have reduced the number of providers willing to write medical
26 exemptions, including problematic ones; additionally, the numbers in this study may be peculiar
27 to this region of the state, and the study does not claim to have exhaustively collected all
28 medical exemptions issued in the county during the study period. However, the proportion of
29 concerning exemptions in this set was apparently much greater than the amount rejected

1 under statute thus far, and other policy reviews have highlighted the need for future
2 monitoring of medical exemptions (14).

3 The number and nature of the medical exemptions reviewed here raise concerns over
4 their impact on immunization rates, especially with respect to the current climate around
5 COVID-19 immunization. When personal belief exemptions were eliminated, the number of
6 medical exemptions increased dramatically in this study, making it an important determiner of
7 community immunity. Additionally, the medical reasoning used for many of the exemptions
8 reviewed here did not adhere to evidence-based standards. Future school vaccination policies
9 may need to ensure regulatory oversight of medical exemptions so that students who
10 legitimately cannot receive vaccines will remain protected by the students who do.

11

12 **References**

13 1. California Legislative Information. Health and Safety Code: educational and child care facility
14 immunization requirements, §§120325-120380. Available from:

15 [https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=HSC§ionNu](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=HSC§ionNum=120370)
16 [m=120370](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=HSC§ionNum=120370)

17

18 2. California Department of Public Health, Immunization Branch. 2017–2018 kindergarten
19 immunization assessment. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Public Health, 2018.

20 Available from:

21 [https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/CDPH%20Document%20Library/Immunization/](https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/CDPH%20Document%20Library/Immunization/2017-2018KindergartenSummaryReport.pdf)
22 [2017-2018KindergartenSummaryReport.pdf](https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/CDPH%20Document%20Library/Immunization/2017-2018KindergartenSummaryReport.pdf)

23

24 3. California Department of Public Health, Immunization Branch. 2017–2018 7th Grade
25 immunization assessment. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Public Health, 2018.

26 Available from: <http://eziz.org/assets/docs/shotsforschool/2017->

27 [18CA7thGradeAssessmentSummary.pdf](http://eziz.org/assets/docs/shotsforschool/2017-18CA7thGradeAssessmentSummary.pdf)

28

- 1 4. Delamater PL, Leslie TF, Yang YT. Change in medical exemptions from immunization in
2 California after elimination of personal belief exemptions. JAMA. 2017;318:863–4.
3
- 4 5. California Department of Public Health, Immunization Branch. 2018–2019 kindergarten
5 immunization assessment. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Public Health, 2019.
6 Available from: [https://eziz.org/assets/docs/shotsforschool/2018-
7 19CAKindergartenSummaryReport.pdf](https://eziz.org/assets/docs/shotsforschool/2018-19CAKindergartenSummaryReport.pdf)
8
- 9 6. California Department of Public Health, Immunization Branch. 2018–2019 7th Grade
10 immunization assessment. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Public Health, 2019.
11 Available from: [https://eziz.org/assets/docs/shotsforschool/2018-
12 2019CA7thGradeSummaryReport.pdf](https://eziz.org/assets/docs/shotsforschool/2018-2019CA7thGradeSummaryReport.pdf)
13
- 14 7. California Department of Public Health, Immunization Branch. 2019–2020 kindergarten
15 immunization assessment. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Public Health, 2020.
16 Available from: [https://eziz.org/assets/docs/shotsforschool/2019-
17 2020CAKindergartenSummaryReport.pdf](https://eziz.org/assets/docs/shotsforschool/2019-2020CAKindergartenSummaryReport.pdf)
18
- 19 8. U.S. Census. County Population Totals and Components of Change: 2010–2019. Washington,
20 DC: United States Census, 2020.
21
- 22 9. CDC. Contraindications and Precautions to Vaccination. In: Epidemiology and Prevention of
23 Vaccine-Preventable Diseases. Hamborsky J, Kroger A, Wolfe S, eds. 13th ed. Washington, DC:
24 Public Health Foundation, 2015.
25
- 26 10. CDC Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP). Vaccine Recommendations and
27 Guidelines of the ACIP. Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/hcp/acip-recs/index.html>
28

- 1 11. California State Legislature. Senate Bill 276 (2019–2020), Immunizations: medical
2 exemptions. Available from:
3 https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201920200SB276
4
- 5 12. California State Legislature. Senate Bill 714 (2019–2020), Immunizations. Available from:
6 https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201920200SB714
7
- 8 13. Koseff, A. California rejected 6% of medical exemptions for school vaccinations this year, in
9 hint of fight ahead. San Francisco Chronicle, October 24, 2021. Available from:
10 [https://www.sfchronicle.com/politics/article/California-rejected-6-of-medical-exemptions-for-](https://www.sfchronicle.com/politics/article/California-rejected-6-of-medical-exemptions-for-16556125.php)
11 [16556125.php](https://www.sfchronicle.com/politics/article/California-rejected-6-of-medical-exemptions-for-16556125.php)
12
- 13 14. Bednarczyk RA, King AR, Lahijani A, Omer SB. Current landscape of nonmedical vaccination
14 exemptions in the United States: impact of policy changes. Expert Rev Vaccines. 2019 Feb;
15 18(2): 175–190.
16

1 **TABLE 1. Number of medical vaccine exemptions per provider, total number of medical**
2 **exemptions written, and average number written by each provider — Riverside County,**
3 **California, August 2016–August 2019**

No. of medical exemptions written per provider	No. (%) of 614 total exemptions written	No. (%) of 156 providers who wrote exemptions	Average no. exemptions written per provider
<10	243 (39.6)	147 (94.2)	1.7
10–20	48 (7.8)	3 (1.9)	16.0
21–30	68 (11.1)	3 (1.9)	22.7
31–70	0 (0)	0 (0)	0
71–80	78 (12.7)	1 (0.6)	78.0
>80	177 (29.2)	2 (1.3)	88.5

4

1 **TABLE 2. Distribution of coded justification and justification groups of medical exemptions to**
 2 **all vaccinations (n = 471) — Riverside County, California, 2016–2019 (1)**
 3

Justification or justification group	No. (%) of exemptions
Family history-based	
Family history of autoimmune disorders other than allergy	263 (55.8)
Family history of vaccine reaction, sequelae or allergy	189 (40.1)
Family history of neurologic/developmental disorder other than ASD (2)	145 (30.8)
Family history of allergy other than vaccine allergy or reaction	124 (26.3)
Family history of psychiatric disorder	76 (16.1)
Unspecified statement of “family history” or “genetic susceptibility”	24 (5.1)
Family history of ASD (2)	22 (4.7)
Family history of malignancy	17 (3.6)
Family history of gastrointestinal disorders other than autoimmune	5 (1.1)
Family history of Lyme disease	1 (0.2)
Family history of Guillain-Barre syndrome	1 (0.2)
Family history of MTHFR (3) genetic abnormality	1 (0.2)
Student medical history-based	
History of vaccine reaction, sequelae or allergy	169 (35.9)
History of neurologic or developmental disorder other than ASD (2)	63 (13.4)
History of allergy other than vaccine allergy or reaction	52 (11.0)
Unspecified general statement of “medical history”	43 (9.1)
MTHFR (3) genetic abnormality	42 (8.9)
History of autoimmune disorders other than allergy	40 (8.5)
History of ASD (2)	15 (3.2)
History of psychiatric disorder	6 (1.3)
Drug-induced immunosuppression, including transplant recipients	5 (1.1)
Testing in progress	5 (1.1)

History of recurrent upper respiratory infections	4 (0.8)
History of cardiac disease other than transplant recipient	2 (0.4)
Already immune due to positive titer or other testing	2 (0.4)
Chromosomal duplication 15q syndrome	2 (0.4)
History of immunodeficiency	2 (0.4)
Failure to thrive	1 (0.2)
Acute disseminated encephalomyelitis	1 (0.2)
History of recent infection not otherwise specified	1 (0.2)
Gastroschisis	1 (0.2)
History of malignancy	1 (0.2)


1

2 (1) Exemptions may contain multiple justifications.

3 (2) Autism spectrum disorder.

4 (3) Methylenetetrahydrofolate reductase.

5



1
2
3
4

(1) Senate Bill 277 effective July 1, 2016.

(2) Senate Bills 276 and 714 passed September 9, 2019 and effective January 1, 2021.