From:

Johnson Family Chiropractic < johnsonfamilychiropractic@verizon.net>

Sent:

Monday, May 09, 2016 3:04 PM

To:

ED, State Board of Ed; Findley, Cynthia

Subject:

Proposed Mandatory Vaccination Changes for IRRC #3146 & 3147

Attachments:

Vaccination letter against proposed changes.docx

Dear Ms Findley & Ms. Molchanow,

I am a Pa resident and practicing Doctor in our great state. I am writing you in regards to the proposed mandatory vaccination changes in IRRC #3146 & 3147

. Please read my attached letter and please do not allow this terrible changes to be made.

Sincerely,

Dr. Teresa D'Aversa Johnson

Washington, Pa

I am a Pennsylvania state resident as well as a licensed Doctor & mother of 2 small children and I am completely against all proposed changes to the current vaccine policy! I urge you to withdraw these new proposed regulations and do NOT issue mandates regarding vaccinations. I would like to voice my opinion on the proposed changes to vaccination policy for ALL Pennsylvania students. First I would like to state that it is a violation of human rights to force vaccines on people. Vaccinations should be recommendations not requirements. They are medical treatments with serious risks that should be a private matter discussed by patients and doctors. Vaccinations should also only be administered by family doctors and pediatricians in their offices, not at drug stores or in schools. Schools should not be able to ask for medical information such as vaccination status. If people are not allowed to be discriminated against when they have communicable diseases such as AIDS, hepatitis, or herpes, then disease free people should not be discriminated against and prevented from keeping jobs or attending school because of vaccination status. It is absolutely wrong and unethical to strip Americans of their freedom to make decisions regarding medical procedures for themselves and their families.

As a health care provider, I pride myself on teaching my patients about true health and teaching them to take charge of their health and the health of their families. A large part of that involves them having the RIGHT to choose what medical procedures are best for their family given their specific health needs. I am appalled that our great state of Pennsylvania wants to completely strip us of our freedom to choose what is best for our family. I have dedicated my life's work to better understanding the human body and how to restore health and maintain it for our families. I personally have spent considerably more time studying the research and case histories to gain a full understanding on vaccinations much more than most politicians who are often blinded by the truth due to their political position. Please review the following objections I have for the proposed changes.

As for the proposed changes:

- 1)I oppose the decrease in the provisional period for student enrollment from 240 days to 5 days. I find this change to be extreme. NO nearby states have such short provisional periods; their average is 58 days. Five days is not enough time to schedule appointments or for students who may be sick to recover before getting vaccinated. Parents will face stress and unnecessary expense as they make appointments and submit paperwork. A 60 day provisional period will give parents and sick children time to meet the requirements without undue stress. Given the later reporting date, a 60 day provisional period would not interfere with school data collection and analysis.
- 2) I oppose the requirement of proof of natural immunity for chicken pox through having contracted the disease must now be provided by a doctor, physician's assistant, or nurse practitioner. It is irresponsible for the DOH to insist that a highly contagious child visit a medical facility where other children, including the medically fragile, will likely be present for the sole purpose of receiving an official chicken pox diagnosis. This move could increase the spread of the disease. Not all families have existing relationships with the list of specified medical workers, and this provision could force a family to enter into a new contractual relationship with unknown medical staff during a stressful time. Most families will also have the financial burden of all charges, or co—pays as well as laboratory fees. Additionally, this requirement creates an environment of distrust between the school staff and the parents as the parents' word is questioned.
- 3)I oppose the Addition of Meningococcal vaccine for students entering 12th grade. The addition of this vaccine is not only unnecessary but would significantly raise costs and risks that far outweigh any possible benefit. The disease is extremely rare; the incidence rate for meningococcal disease, according to the CDC, is 0.3—0.5/100,000. According to the PA Department of Health EDDIE database, in 2014, there were only 16 new cases of meningitis. Vaccinating the estimated 147,040 seniors in 2014, would have cost parents and taxpayers over \$16,000,000. The CDC states that all serogroups of the disease are on the decline, including serogroup B, which is not even included in the vaccine. Earlier this legislative session, a bill was introduced to mandate this vaccine for students entering 12th grade. The legislature did not see the necessity of such a mandate and thus chose not to act. The Department of Health is seeking to circumvent the legislative process in enforcing mandates that are not supported by lawmakers. This vaccine is already available to anyone who wants it.

According to vaccine manufacturer package inserts, post marketing surveillance for the meningitis vaccine has shown the following: hypersensitivity reactions such as anaphylaxis/anaphylactic reaction, wheezing, difficulty breathing, upper airway swelling, urticaria, erythema, pruritus, hypotension, Guillain—Barré syndrome, paraesthesia, vasovagal syncope, dizziness, convulsion, facial palsy, acute disseminated encephalomyelitis, transverse myelitis, and myalgia.

4)I oppose the Inclusion of Pertussis vaccine for kindergarten admission. We are currently seeing outbreaks of pertussis among fully vaccinated populations. The CDC and top doctors are verifying the lack of efficacy and the early waning of any immunity provided by this vaccine. In February 2016, The American Academy of Pediatrics published that Tdap provided moderate defense against the illness (pertussis) during the first year after vaccination but not much longer. Immunity waned during the second year, and little protection remained 2 to 3 years after vaccination. It seems hasty to add a vaccine that is currently under scrutiny from the medical community to the requirements. Meningitis and T dap vaccines are pharmaceutical products that carry a risk of injury or death, a fact that was acknowledged by the U.S. Congress in 1986 when it passed the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act. Since 1988, the federal vaccine injury compensation program created under that law has awarded more than \$3.2 billion to children and adults injured by vaccines or to families whose loved ones died from vaccine reactions, although two out of three who apply are denied compensation. The Institute of Medicine in a series of reports on vaccine safety spanning 25 years has acknowledged there is individual susceptibility to vaccine reactions for genetic, biological and environmental reasons that have not been fully defined by science, and doctors often cannot predict ahead of time who will be harmed!

Long standing gaps in vaccine safety research and emerging evidence that certain vaccines do not prevent infection or transmission of disease, urgently require legal protection of physician's rights and parental rights regarding medical and religious exemptions to vaccination for minor children. Vaccine Manufacturers for Meningitis Vaccines Have No Civil Liability. The 1986 law partially shielded drug companies selling vaccines in the U.S. from civil liability and, in 2011, the US Supreme Court completely shielded vaccine manufacturers from liability for FDA licensed and CDC recommended vaccines. There is no product liability or accountability for pharmaceutical companies marketing federally recommended and state mandated vaccines that injure Americans or cause their death, which makes flexible medical and non-medical vaccine exemptions in vaccine policies and laws the only way Americans can protect themselves and their children from vaccine risks and failures.

5) I oppose the DOH proposes to edit the current regulations by eliminating separate listings for measles, mumps, rubella, tetanus, diphtheria, and pertussis vaccines that are currently most commonly consumed as combination shots. Instead, they will only be listed in the regulations in their combination forms - and TDaP. Evidence of Immunity is different for some of the vaccines and the proposed regulations are unclear. I strongly oppose this change. I feel that all antigens should be listed individually. This will simplify the amendment process should these combinations change in the future. We also want to ensure accuracy in data collection and publication. Some of these vaccines are still available singularly, and so listing each antigen individually is best and should not be changed. Each disease should individually list what can be given as evidence of immunity.

Finally, Herd Immunity claims are given without clarification or verification. The Department of Health bases their reasoning for increasing vaccination mandates on the theory of herd immunity which was first developed when studying individuals who had the wild diseases, not those who had been vaccinated. Disease outbreaks continue to occur in populations that have reached 100% vaccination rates, rendering this theory unreliable for massive vaccination requirements.

Sincerely, Dr. Teresa D'Aversa Johnson, DC Washington, Pa