

1 with both California Code of Regulations, title 17, section 6025 and provisions of Education Code
2 section 51745 et seq.

3 “Under the normal rules of preemption, a local ordinance that conflicts with state law is preempted
4 by the state law and void. . . . Pursuant to preemption law, a conflict exists if the local legislation
5 duplicates, contradicts, or enters an area fully occupied by general law, either expressly or by
6 legislative implication.” (*Haytasingh v. City of San Diego* (2021) 286 Cal.Rptr.3d 364, 392; see
7 generally *O’Connell v. City of Stockton* (2007) 41 Cal.4th 1061; *American Financial Services Assn.*
8 *v. City of Oakland* (2005) 34 Cal.4th 1239.)

9 More than a century ago, the Legislature began regulating the field of school vaccination
10 requirements. In 1890, the California Supreme Court upheld a “Vaccination Act” that required
11 schools to exclude children who had not been vaccinated against smallpox. (*Abeel v. Clark* (1890)
12 84 Cal. 226, 227–228, 230.) The Court stated that vaccination, “being the most effective method
13 known of preventing the spread of the disease referred to, it was for the legislature to determine
14 whether the scholars of the public schools should be subjected to it.” (*Id.* at p. 230, emphasis
15 added.) The Legislature subsequently put control of smallpox under the direction of the State
16 Department of Public Health (DPH) and provided that “no rule or regulation on the subject of
17 vaccination shall be adopted by school or local health authorities.” (Educ. Code, § 49405, emphasis
18 added; see also Health & Saf. Code § 131052, subd. (3).)

19 Between 1961 and 2010, the Legislature imposed a total of 10 vaccine requirements for school
20 children—diphtheria, hepatitis B, haemophilus influenza type b, measles, mumps, pertussis,
21 poliomyelitis, rubella, tetanus, and varicella. (Health & Saf. Code, §§ 120325, subd. (a)(1)–(10),
22 120335, subd. (b)(1)–(10); see Assem. Com. on Health, Analysis of Sen. Bill No. 277 (2015–2016
23 Reg. Sess.) as amended May 7, 2015, p. 4.) “Each of the 10 diseases was added to the California
24 code through legislative action, after careful consideration of the public health risks of these
25 diseases, cost to the state and health system, communicability, and rates of transmission.” (*Love v.*
26 *State Department of Education* (2018) 29 Cal.App.5th 980, 987, emphasis added.) A detailed
27 statutory and regulatory scheme has been established to implement the school vaccine mandates.
28 (See Health & Saf. Code, § 120325 et seq.; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 17, § 6000 et seq.) The scheme
included exemptions for both medical reasons and personal beliefs. (See Health & Saf. Code, §
120370; former Health & Saf. Code, § 120365.)

19 In 2015, in response to decreasing vaccination rates and a rise in measles, the Legislature removed
20 the “personal beliefs” exemption to these 10 school vaccination requirements. (Sen. Bill No. 277
21 (2015–2016) §§ 1, 4; see generally *Love, supra*, 29 Cal.App.5th 980; *Brown v. Smith* (2018) 24
22 Cal.App.5th 1135.) In doing so, the Legislature considered whether “the issue of public health
23 could be addressed by mandating vaccines on a community by community or school district [by]
24 school district basis,” but concluded that “a statewide approach is the correct approach.” (Sen.
25 Com. on Judiciary, Analysis of Sen. Bill No. 277 (2015–2016) as amended Apr. 22, 2015, p. 18.)
26 “To provide a statewide standard, allows for a consistent policy that can be publicized in a uniform
27 manner, so districts and educational efforts may be enacted with best practices for each district. . . .
28 Further in consultation with various health officers, they believe a statewide policy provides them
the tools to protect all children equally from an outbreak.” (*Ibid.*)

Recognizing the need for additional vaccine mandates that may arise in the future, the Legislature
added a “number 11” mandating that school children be vaccinated against “[a]ny other disease

1 deemed appropriate by the [State Department of Public Health], taking into consideration the
2 recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices of the United States
3 Department of Health and Human Services, the American Academy of Pediatrics, and the
4 American Academy of Family Physicians.” (Health & Saf. Code, §§ 120325, subd. (a)(11),
5 120335, subd. (b)(11); see also *id.* at § 131051, subd. (a)(3)(J).) However, because the addition of a
6 new mandate via this “catch all” provision “disrupts the careful balancing of the various rights
7 involved” in the legislative process, the Legislature decided to maintain the “personal beliefs”
8 exemption for new vaccination requirements added by the DPH. (*Id.* at § 120338; Sen. Com. on
9 Judiciary, Analysis of Sen. Bill No. 277 (2015–2016) as amended Apr. 22, 2015, pp. 17–18.)

10 The DPH is charged with adopting and enforcing regulations to carry out the vaccination
11 requirements. (Health & Saf. Code, § 120330; see Cal. Code Regs., tit. 17, § 6000 et seq.) The
12 DPH has not added COVID-19 as a required vaccine under the “catch all” provision, which would
13 need to include a personal belief exemption. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 17, § 6025; see Health & Saf.
14 Code, § 120338.) Rather, DPH regulations state that a school “shall unconditionally admit or allow
15 continued attendance” to any student who has either received each of 10 enumerated vaccines or
16 obtained an exemption. (*Ibid.*, emphasis added; see also *Puerta v. Torres* (2011) 195 Cal.App.4th
17 1267, 1272 [“The term ‘shall’ is mandatory”].)

18 Vaccination requirements do not apply to students who are enrolled in an independent study
19 program and not receiving classroom-based instruction. (Health & Saf. Code, § 120335, subd. (f).)
20 However, the decision to participate in independent study must be voluntary. (See Educ. Code, §§
21 51747, subds. (f), (g)(8), 51749.5, subd. (a)(9), (12), 51749.6, subd. (a)(6); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, §
22 11700, subd. (d).) Thus, if students have received all 10 vaccinations, a school district cannot force
23 or coerce them into non-classroom-based independent study.

24 In light of the above, it is clear that SDUSD’s Roadmap attempts to impose an additional
25 requirement in a field that the Legislature fully occupies through Health and Safety Code section
26 120325 et seq. The Legislature intended a statewide standard for school vaccination requirements
27 and established a detailed scheme. The Legislature expressly contemplated the addition of new
28 vaccine mandates without further legislative action, but assigned that responsibility to the DPH,
taking into account recommendations from other relevant agencies and organizations and
mandating that those new mandates include a personal belief exemption. The statutory scheme
leaves no room for each of the over 1,000 individual school districts to impose a patchwork of
additional vaccine mandates, including those like the Roadmap that lack a personal belief
exemption and therefore are even stricter than what the DPH could itself impose upon learned
consideration.

SDUSD is correct that certain statutes contemplate school districts administering vaccines in
cooperation with local health officers to help prevent and control communicable diseases in school
age children, including “diseases that represent a current or potential outbreak as declared by a
federal, state, or local public health officer,” provided the district has received parental consent.
(See Educ. Code, § 49403; see also Health & Saf. Code, §§ 120375, subd. (d), 120380.) However,
the Roadmap was not enacted to cooperate with the local health officer, and more to the point, those
statutes do not detract from the Legislature’s intent to occupy the field of mandating a specific
vaccine for school age children.

1 SDUSD's Roadmap also attempts to impose an additional requirement that directly conflicts with
2 California Code of Regulations, title 17, section 6025 and the above referenced provisions of
3 Education Code section 51745 et seq. SDUSD is required to admit students and allow their
4 continued in-person attendance as long as they have received the 10 enumerated vaccines.
5 SDUSD's attempt to impose an additional vaccine mandate and force students (both new and
6 current) who defy it into non-classroom-based independent study directly conflicts with state law.

7 The sole function of this Court is to determine whether the Roadmap is preempted by state law.
8 SDUSD's Roadmap appears to be necessary and rational, and the district's desire to protect its
9 students from COVID-19 is commendable. Unfortunately, the field of school vaccine mandates has
10 been fully occupied by the State, and the Roadmap directly conflicts with state law. The addition of
11 a COVID-19 vaccine mandate without a personal belief exemption must be imposed by the
12 Legislature. Accordingly, this Court is compelled to **GRANT** the petitions for writ of mandate.

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28