

A-E-D BILL SUPPORTERS

http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/15-16/bill/sen/sb_0651-0700/sb_658_cfa_20150406_153545_sen_comm.html

9.Support. Philips, a maker of AEDs, states in support that

California's current AED liability requirements are onerous, outdated, and do not reflect the current capabilities of AEDs in the marketplace. Building owners and those responsible for sites where AEDs are located are therefore dissuaded from purchasing and placing AEDs, out of fear they will not be granted immunity from civil liability. The California State Sheriffs' Association states in support that by eliminating outdated and burdensome requirements that must be met to confer protection from liability, the Legislature could encourage wider access to AEDs and increase their life-saving capacity. The California Business Properties Association, the Building Owners and Managers Association of California, the Commercial Real Estate Development Association, and the International Council of Shopping Centers jointly write in support that existing law may have made sense over a decade ago, but due to evolving technology and ease of AED use, have since become an anachronism and are an impediment to installation. The California Chamber of Commerce notes in support that this bill still holds a manufacturer, developer, installer, or distributor liable for potential product defects or performance, and that this bill continues to mandate that

any person or entity that acquires an AED notify the local EMS agency of its placement as well as ensure that the AED is regularly maintained and tested. The American Heart Association states in support that while it believes that requirements in current law are important, it knows that sudden cardiac arrest is 100 percent fatal if not treated