FORM LETTER B 1-

## Kathy Cooper

Tina Marie <nursetina.pitt@gmail.com></nursetina.pitt@gmail.com>	
IRRC # 3146 & 3147 - Proposed changes	

This message shall be construed to be my "public comment".

Please be advised that I am opposed to the following proposed changes outlined in IRRC # 3146 and IRRC # 3147:

-9 M

In particular I am most opposed to:

- 1. The decrease of the provisional period for student enrollment from the current 240 days down to a mere 5 days.
- 2. The requirement that requires doctors, physicians' assistant, or nurse practitioner to prove natural immunity for chicken pox through having contracted the disease.
- 3. The addition of meningococcal vaccine for students entering the 12<sup>th</sup> grade.
- 4. Mandatory pertussis vaccine for kindergarten admission.
- 5. The Department of Health proposal to edit current regulations by eliminating separate listings for measles, mumps, rubella, tetanus, diphtheria, and pertussis vaccines that are currently most commonly consumed as combination shots. I also oppose the listing in the regulations in their combination forms such as MMR and TDaP.

There is a very strong need to require STANDARDIZED language regarding communications regarding immunization requirements. The various school districts need to be allowed to communicate on the same page throughout our commonwealth concerning parent's rights under the law in order to make the best judgments to immunize or to not immunize their children, according to their religious and/or philosophical beliefs. Please refer to the document found at <u>http://www.pacic.org/assets/DOH\_comments\_final.pdf</u>.

I recently became a grandmother for the first time in my life. My granddaughter received her vaccinations as per the CDC guidelines. After her 3<sup>rd</sup> month scheduled vaccinations she had a very severe reaction which included fever, diarrhea, and an encephalitic cry (which I am very familiar with as a nurse in the healthcare industry). With each high pitched scream she thrashed her right arm backwards. These symptoms lasted approximately 10 days before her behavior returned to a more normal status. We would like the option to have her sensitivities tested before proceeding with the recommended scheduled vaccinations to ensure she will not suffer more permanent damage. I do not understand why the SCOTUS has labeled vaccines to be "unavoidably

I would like to thank you in advance for registering my public comments. Please carefully consider the implications of removing these provisions before placing any new regulations.

Respectfully yours,

Tina M. Mack

 $\sim 1$ 

3661 Evergreen Rd

Pulaski, PA 16143



stopher Mack <cmbmack88@verizon.net> lay, May 08, 2016 7:39 PM ateboardofed@pa.gov; IRRC; csainato@pahousegop.com; evogel@pasen.gov # 3146, 3147; public comment period ending 05/09/2016</cmbmack88@verizon.net>

FORM LETTERB

This message shall be construed to be my "public comment".

Please be advised that I am opposed to the following proposed changes outlined in IRRC # 3146 and IRRC # 3147:

2016 MAY - 9

6

20

In particular I am most opposed to:

- 1. The decrease of the provisional period for student enrollment from the current 240 days down to a mere 5 days.
- 2. The requirement that requires doctors, physicians' assistant, or nurse practitioner to prove natural immunity for chicken pox through having contracted the disease.
- 3. The addition of meningococcal vaccine for students entering the 12<sup>th</sup> grade.
- 4. Mandatory pertussis vaccine for kindergarten admission.
- 5. The Department of Health proposal to edit current regulations by eliminating separate listings for measles, mumps, rubella, tetanus, diphtheria, and pertussis vaccines that are currently most commonly consumed as combination shots. I also oppose the listing in the regulations in their combination forms such as MMR and TDaP.

There is a very strong need to require STANDARDIZED language regarding communications regarding immunization requirements. The various school districts need to be allowed to communicate on the same page throughout our commonwealth concerning parent's rights under the law in order to make the best judgments to immunize or to not immunize their children, according to their religious and/or philosophical beliefs. Please refer to the document found at <u>http://www.pacic.org/assets/DOH\_comments\_final.pdf</u>.

I recently became a grandfather for the first time in my life. My granddaughter received her vaccinations as per the CDC guidelines. After her 3<sup>rd</sup> month scheduled vaccinations she had a very severe reaction which included fever, diarrhea, and an encephalitic cry (which I am very familiar with as a nurse in the healthcare industry). With each high pitched scream she thrashed her right arm backwards. These symptoms lasted approximately 10 days before her behavior returned to a more normal status. We would like the option to have her sensitivities tested before proceeding with the recommended scheduled vaccinations to ensure she will not suffer more permanent damage. I do not understand why the SCOTUS has labeled vaccines to be "unavoidably unsafe" and yet no safeguards have been taken by the DOH. It is absurd to me that such great risks are being taken on the lives of so many very young and fragile children.

I would like to thank you in advance for registering my public comments. Please carefully consider the implications of removing these provisions before placing any new regulations.

Respectfully yours,

Christopher Mack 3661 Evergreen Rd Pulaski, PA 16143