

**Senate Health & Human Services**

**01/29/2026 01:30 PM**

**SB26-032 Promoting Immunization Access**

**Typed Text of Testimony Submitted**

<b>Name, Position, Representing</b>	<b>Typed Text of Testimony</b>
Tiffany Vis  Against  themselves	<p>Good morning Members of the Joint Budget Committee,</p> <p>I am writing to you as a deeply concerned family member and long-time witness to the realities of caregiving to express my opposition to the proposed caps on Medicaid caregiving hours for family caregivers. These proposed changes are alarming—not only for my nephew, but also for my mother and many others whose lives depend on consistent, skilled, and compassionate care.</p> <p>My nephew is a medically complex child who requires continuous, hands-on support to remain safe, healthy, and integrated into daily life. His needs are not theoretical or flexible—they are constant and demanding. Reducing or capping caregiver hours does not reduce his needs; it simply transfers the burden onto families already stretched beyond capacity. I worry deeply about the immediate and long-term consequences these changes would have on his well-being and quality of life.</p> <p>I am particularly concerned about the proposed use of an “age-appropriate” calculator to assess caregiving needs. Just because my nephew—and other individuals with special needs—are under the age of six does not mean they require less care. Disability does not follow a developmental calendar. The assumption that age alone can determine caregiving intensity ignores the lived reality of families like ours.</p>

I watch my sister daily as she carries the full weight of caregiving for her son. The physical, mental, and emotional toll is immense, and I genuinely worry about her health. Even as a capable, healthy 30-year-old adult, when I care for my nephew for just a few hours, it is profoundly demanding on my body, my mind, and my heart. This is not ordinary childcare—it is complex, relentless care that requires stamina, skill, and constant vigilance. Expecting families to absorb even more of this burden because of an arbitrary age-based calculation is not sustainable or humane.

I am also the daughter of a mother who has battled multiple forms of cancer, lives with a long history of mental illness, and is currently fighting COPD, among other serious health conditions. I have seen firsthand how fragile stability can be for someone with complex medical and mental health needs—and how essential consistent, knowledgeable caregiving is to maintaining that stability. Reductions in care do not create efficiency; they create crisis.

Beyond my own family, I have spent years observing the caregiving field more broadly, and there is already a severe shortage of qualified caregivers. Even when funding exists, there are simply not enough trained, reliable professionals to meet the needs of medically complex individuals. This is especially true for cases like my nephew's, or my friend Michelle's—a quadriplegic due to a spinal injury—whose care requires skill, consistency, and trust built over time. These roles cannot be filled quickly or interchangeably.

Family caregivers step in not because it is easy or convenient, but because we must. Without family caregivers, the state would face far greater costs through increased hospitalizations, institutionalization, emergency interventions, and system overload. Family caregiving is not a luxury—it is a critical pillar of our healthcare system that saves the state money while preserving dignity and humanity.

I am deeply concerned that these proposed changes fail to account for the realities faced by families like mine and countless others across the state. They place vulnerable individuals at risk and push

	<p>caregivers closer to burnout, illness, and financial instability. The downstream human and financial costs will far outweigh any short-term budgetary savings.</p> <p>I urge you to reconsider these proposed caps and the use of age-based calculators, and to protect the services that allow medically complex individuals to remain safe in their homes and communities. Please consider the real lives behind these policies—children, parents, and families whose stability depends on your decisions.</p> <p>Thank you for your time, consideration, and service. I hope you will vote with compassion, foresight, and a true understanding of the realities of caregiving.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Tiffany vis</p>
<p>Frank Reiser Against themselves</p>	<p>There should be no requirements for immunization. We should have the right to health freedom and determine what goes into our bodies especially when the vaccine companies have no liability. They have no reason to make them safe. Most of these diseases disappeared from better sanitation and living conditions. Vaccines had very little effect</p>
<p>James Crawford Against themselves</p>	<p>Dear Committee Members,</p> <p>Please state that those dispensing vaccines that are not recommended by ACIP will be open to law suits for any vaccine injury caused by their vaccination. They won't have the liability protection afforded by the 1986 Childhood Vaccine Injury Act period. So they might think twice when it hits their bottom line.</p> <p>Thanks Jim</p>
<p>Cynthia Nevison Against themselves</p>	<p>Good afternoon,</p> <p>I work as a contractor to the CDC's ACIP committee but I'm representing myself in this comment as a concerned Colorado parent.</p>

	<p>A recent study by UCLA and Children’s Hospital of Philadelphia found that the health of US children has worsened across a wide range of indicators over the past 17 years, and that the percentage of children with chronic conditions has increased from 40% to 46% over the last 13 years alone (1). Scientific studies increasingly recognize that the aggressive U.S. childhood immunization schedule is an important cause of many of these chronic conditions, which are often neuroimmunological in nature or involve hyperreactive immune system disorders (2).</p> <p>We are fortunate to have a caring and hardworking new Secretary of Health and Human Services who has dedicated himself to reversing the tragic decline in our children’s health. It is discouraging to me, as a former Democrat, that blue states are obstructing Kennedy’s efforts every step of the way. They are objecting to even the most common-sense reforms, like not recommending COVID shots for children or not injecting a newborn baby on day 1 of life with immune-stimulating, neurotoxic chemicals for a disease for which more than 99% of babies are at zero risk.</p> <p>Many Coloradans support Secretary Kennedy and applaud the reforms he is making. Only 13% of parents nationwide gave their children a COVID booster in 2024/2025 (3). A recent Washington Post survey of parents found that 35% think vaccines don’t undergo enough safety testing and 26% think the CDC recommends too many vaccines (4). Continuing to insist that none of the concerns parents have about excessive vaccination are valid only further erodes the trust in public health officials that was deservedly lost during their mishandling of COVID.</p> <p>Under Secretary Kennedy, HHS recognized that the U.S. was recommending 18 different vaccines amounting to some 90-100 disease-doses over the course of childhood. This was far more than any other country in the world. HHS’ new schedule removes unnecessary and/or ineffective vaccines and focuses on a reduced list of vaccines for the diseases that pose the greatest actual risk to</p>
--	---

	<p>infants and children. Colorado should embrace this new recommendation, rather than trying to thwart it.</p> <p>Furthermore, the insistence that Colorado can continue to follow the old schedule and still enjoy blanket liability protection when people sue, after they or their children are inevitably injured by vaccines, rests on shaky legal ground.</p> <p>Democrats lost the last Presidential election in large part because of MAHA voters and will continue to lose until they come over to the right side of this issue and work together with Kennedy rather than against him.</p> <p>References</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) <a href="https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/2836060">https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/2836060</a></li> <li>2) <a href="https://zenodo.org/records/17451259">https://zenodo.org/records/17451259</a></li> <li>3) <a href="https://www.cdc.gov/covidvaxview/weekly-dashboard/child-coverage-vaccination.html">https://www.cdc.gov/covidvaxview/weekly-dashboard/child-coverage-vaccination.html</a></li> <li>4) <a href="https://www.washingtonpost.com/health/2025/10/10/pediatricians-vaccine-trust-influencers-rfk-jr/">https://www.washingtonpost.com/health/2025/10/10/pediatricians-vaccine-trust-influencers-rfk-jr/</a></li> </ol>
<p>Beryl Meyertons</p> <p>Against themselves</p>	<p>To Health and Human Services Committee Members,</p> <p>SB26 032 I would like to ask you to vote against this bill. There is no liability unless filed after 2029, or different parts filed before 2029. This bill encourages the ACA recommendations against the ACIP recommendations. There should not be mandatory vaccines especially for infants or newborns. Parent's and caregivers should be given accurate honest information about the risks, ingredients and side effects of the vaccines.</p> <p>Upholding parents right to how they want to immunize their children is not taken into consideration. Autonomy.</p>

	<p>Thank you for your consideration,</p> <p>B. Meyertons</p>
<p>Beverly Byer Against themselves</p>	<p>I strongly oppose SB26-032 which would favor what the AAP wants you to do regarding the childhood vaccination schedule instead of going with the ACiP recommendations. The AAP is not acting in good faith by being open to finding out whether vaccines are safe and effective. Also, going with this bill would make our state liable for injuries due to vaccines. Beverly Byer</p>
<p>Pati Thomas Against themselves</p>	<p>I adamantly oppose Colorado’s actions to deviate from the recommendations of HHS and the CDC’s recent guidance about vaccines and exemptions. Whereas for decades our state agencies refused to think for themselves, instead deferring to remote federal ‘guidances’ suddenly they are abdicating! While I might like to applaud this new direction as evidence of critical thinking, I am instead of the conviction that drug companies are exerting their influence to promote continued profits for their industry. In the meantime, our nation, and especially our children get sicker and sicker. Considering this shift in our nation’s health in the years since the 1986 Childhood Vaccine Injury Compensation Act, I am most definitely of the educated view that vaccines are certainly a factor. How can Colorado, for example, continue to promote a Hepatitis B vaccine AT DELIVERY, for infants with no risk factors, but much potential risk to their health. For the majority of other vaccines, they are purported to prevent childhood ILLNESSES, not diseases. We must stop referring to these childhood illnesses as DISEASES. Please heed the direction RFK Jr.’s HHS is taking to really do the science with regard to vaccines!</p>
<p>Katy LeVasseur Against themselves</p>	<p>Hello, my name is Katy LeVasseur. I represent myself and my family and I oppose SB 032.</p> <p>Traditionally, the vaccines recommended by ACIP, for many states, translated to the vaccines mandated for school. Now that some previously recommended vaccines have been changed to shared clinical decision making, bills like this one and last month’s CDPHE rule changes are happening in order to keep the status quo.</p>

	<p>Proponents of this bill want to keep those mandates. That force. That coercion. In November of last year on the PBS News Hour, Governor Polis said: "I think mandates are counterproductive." Looks like he sees the value of shared clinical decision making. Of choice. Choosing to receive vaccines or choosing not to.</p> <p>When it comes to vaccines, proponents of this bill believe that one size fits all. They believe they are 'safe and effective.' If that's the case, then why are mandates necessary? If vaccines are so great, then everyone will line up for them. Why can't vaccines just stand on their own merit, just like any other product?</p> <p>That brings us to this big focus on liability in the bill. If vaccines are so safe, why does every entity that has a part in their administration need to have liability protection? Let vaccine manufacturers and the like stand behind their safe and effective products. If this liability protection is so desired, then you are admitting that vaccine injury and death are real.</p> <p>The bill repeatedly specifies who ISN'T liable when there is a vaccine injury or death, no mentions of who IS. At least federally, the government takes on liability with the Vaccine Injury Compensation Program. An extremely flawed program at best, but one does exist. Under this Colorado bill, when injury occurs from a vaccine that is no longer CDC recommended, there isn't anything comparable. The financial burden of lifelong medical care falls entirely on the injured individual if an adult, or on the parents if the injured person is a child. Usually they need to pay out of pocket, outside of covered medicine, as that system doesn't recognize vaccine injury or know how to treat it. Meanwhile, those responsible face no accountability, remain free to profit, and are allowed to continue practices that may result in further harm.</p> <p>Proponents of this bill, have you ever stopped to ask yourselves, how many vaccines might be too many? In the early 2000s, as the</p>
--	---

	<p>childhood schedule rapidly expanded following the 1986 Act that removed liability from manufacturers, many parents began raising legitimate questions about the cumulative safety of an ever-growing number of vaccines. In response, Dr. Paul Offit, a well-known vaccine proponent, attempted to reassure parents by publishing an article in Pediatrics stating that “each infant would have the theoretical capacity to respond to about 10,000 vaccines at any one time.” But “respond to” simply means producing antibodies—it is a claim about immune capability or efficacy, not a statement about safety. The actual safety question was never answered. Nevertheless, the American Academy of Pediatrics—the very organization you claim to be “following the science” of—embraced this statement and repeated it in the Red Book, the authoritative text that guides pediatric practice nationwide. Over time, that theoretical claim was widely misconstrued to suggest that infants could safely receive 10,000 vaccines at once, despite there being no scientific evidence to support such a conclusion. This is not evidence-based medicine; it is the normalization of an untested assumption, and it underscores exactly why blind deference to authority is no substitute for rigorous safety science.</p> <p>Please vote no. Thank you.</p>
<p>Anita Li Against themselves</p>	<p>I’m writing in opposition to the proposed bill, SB26-032. I have read much of the bill and it looks like it is meant to prop up the vaccine industry. To me, it seems that you care more about the vaccine manufacturers and institutions than you care about vulnerable human beings.</p> <p>The bill seeks to ensure that Colorado institutions will have a legal liability shield in the event that children or adults are injured by vaccines. But it does not specify who will assume liability in cases where federal protections for the manufacturers no longer apply. Who will be liable? Who will pay the medical and caregiving bills of the injured? I nominate the bill’s sponsors: Daugherty, Mullica, Feret and Brown.</p>



	<p>To me, bill SB26-032 is reckless and inhumane. Before you vote, I urge you to learn more about the lack of vaccine safety testing in the United States. A good place to start is the following article about Dr. Stanley Plotkin, a prominent American vaccinologist. What Dr. Plotkin said under oath is very important.</p> <p><a href="https://childrenshealthdefense.org/defender/godfather-of-vaccines-said-under-oath-why-it-matters-even-more-today/">https://childrenshealthdefense.org/defender/godfather-of-vaccines-said-under-oath-why-it-matters-even-more-today/</a></p> <p>I urge the State Legislature to take vaccine safety testing seriously. Before you pass the bill, educate yourselves. Please invite attorney Aaron Siri to testify to the Colorado Legislature as he has in Arizona and New Hampshire legislatures.</p> <p>Thank you and good luck.</p>
<p>Candice Oksenhorn Against themselves</p>	<p>I am against this bill.</p>
<p>Sonia Cruz Against themselves</p>	<p>Oppose SB26-032! For a host of reasons, SB26-032 does not support informed consent and gives too many "outs" to those manufacturing, recommending, or administering mandated vaccines on a population that has the right to choose whether or not to receive them. DO NOT limit liability for injuries if vaccines are administered according to the board of health schedule of immunizations or to ACIP's schedule referenced in existing law. Minors cannot vote on this proposed limitation. Considering SB21-016 gave Minors access to be vaccinated with HPV and Hepatitis B Vaccines and all future STD vaccines without parental knowledge or consent, Minors should have the opportunity to prevent limitations on liability for injuries they may encounter from those vaccines. Yet, Article 7 of the Colorado Constitution only gives those who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote, and for good reason. Minors are ill equipped to vote much like they are ill equipped to comprehend the nature of STDs.</p>

	<p>Abstinence and education programs are a better solution than a "protective" band-aid for the what-ifs of childhood. Vaccination for STDs does not equip children with the knowledge needed to avoid risky behaviors, nor does it provide them with adequate vaccination data to provide informed consent. Without informed consent, Minors have the opportunity to say yes to a vaccination that may cause irreparable damage or death, but SB26-032 proposes limitations for injuries these Minors do not yet understand. Minors lack family history and personal medical history to make an informed decision about vaccination, and SB26-032 proposes limitations they cannot vote against for injuries that may alter their lives. In the absence of a fully developed brain and/or knowledge about the risks of vaccinations, minors are entrusted to their parents for emotional, spiritual, educational, physical and medical governance. As a parent of five children, some who are vaccine injured, and two of whom are still minors, I am writing to urge you to OPPOSE SB26-032.</p>
<p>Jeany Rush Against themselves</p>	<p>TO: SENATE COMMITTEE ON HEALTH &amp; HUMAN SERVICES RE: SB26-032 PROMOTING IMMUNIZATION ACCESS SPONSORS: DAUGHERTY, MULLICA, FERET, BROWN FROM: JEANY RUSH, COLORADO CONSTITUENT 1-29-26 VOTE: NO "DO NO HARM"</p> <p>Your continued alignment with organizations not even respecting the Federal HHS guidelines, and many independent medical groups, ACP – AMERICAN COLLEGE OF PEDIATRICIANS, shows you have ignored science! Didn't the AAP receive a \$34,000,000 bonus for playing lock step? Your blatant endorsement of the Medical/Pharma industrial complex over the safety of the people is Glaring! Your bill seeks to further protect the manufacturers, administrators, and even expand pharmacy abilities to dole out the "death shots" you continue to promote, despite the knowledge that Western civilization as we know it has the highest amounts of autism, allergies, and other conditions caused by the entire vaccine schedule. Your bill is something from the Dark Ages, and needs to be totally scrubbed! You learned nothing from the abuse of covid on every single citizen of this nation It is still a bioweapon, not a vaccine, and you still give it to minors in</p>

	<p>Colorado. You seek endorsement from the very organizations who lack the ability to protect our entire nation of minors from mutilation, butchery from falsely placed ideology, with no real science, and which is still experimental at best. How can we trust you to make one single decision to fill our children with toxins no body should need? IS THIS YOUR FORM OF EUGENICS?</p> <p>USING THE SAFETY CLAUSE IS further usurpation of the will of the people, our rights. How can you push these critical issues on us without a vote of the people? This needs to be seen in the light of day, not in the backrooms of your dictatorial efforts. This is not Humane! This is Criminal! This is MalPractice &amp; Govt. Overreach!</p> <p>IN THE FIRST 6 YEARS OF LIFE YOUR CHILD RECEIVES THE FOLLOWING THROUGH VACCINES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>17,500 mcg 2-phenoxyethanol (antifreeze) 5,700 mcg aluminum (neurotoxin)</li><li>Unknown amounts of fetal bovine serum (aborted cow blood)</li><li>801.6 mcg formaldehyde (carcinogen, embalming agent)</li><li>23,250 mcg gelatin (ground up animal carcass)</li><li>500 mcg human albumin (human blood)</li><li>760 mcg of monosodium L-glutamate (causes obesity &amp; diabetes)</li><li>Unknown amounts of MRC-5 cells (aborted human babies)</li><li>Over 10 mcg neomycin (antibiotic)</li><li>Over .075 mcg polymyxin 8 (antibiotic)</li><li>Over 560 mcg polysorbate 80 (carcinogen)</li><li>116 mcg potassium chloride (used in a lethal injection)</li><li>188 mcg potassium phosphate (liquid fertilizer agent)</li><li>260 mcg sodium bicarbonate (baking soda)</li><li>70 mcg sodium borate (Borax, used for cockroach control)</li><li>54,100 mcg of sodium chloride (table salt)</li><li>Unknown amounts of sodium citrate (food additive)</li><li>Unknown amounts of sodium hydroxide (Danger! Corrosive)</li></ul>
--	--

	<p>2,800 mcg sorbitol (toxic to any organism)</p> <p>Unknown amounts of sodium phosphate monobasic monohydrate (toxic to any organisms) 32,000 mcg sorbitol (not to be injected)</p> <p>.6 mcg streptomycin (antibiotic) Over 40,000 mcg sucrose (Cane sugar)</p> <p>5000 mcg urea (metabolic waste from human urine) Other chemical residuals</p> <p>Book: "What the Pharmaceutical Companies Don't Want you to Know about Vaccines " By Dr. Todd M Elsner</p> <p>In this moment, in this day, with the tremendous amount of information we now have about what is in the shots, it defies logic, and decency that you want to incorporate anything from the AAP, American Academy of Pediatrics, about childhood and adolescent immunization. This organization is not a neutral group, when it comes to either science or medicine. They still promote mutilation of minors mentally and physically based on complete ideological, non-scientific butchery! Or has no one heard that we even have executive orders to stop this. Besides this, it is butchery of innocent minors who cannot give INFORMED CONSENT to what happens to their bodies. I saw posted that they received over \$34,000,000 from government grants to promote vaccines. Shouldn't you first have to publically all over the state show what exactly is in each and every shot, pseudo vaccine? And why are we still giving the Covid/bioweapon/false vaccine? That is also a total danger to all humans. This information is also out in front of the public. The harm, death to millions of people is not being told. WHY? Why are you including a shot that goes to infants, for a sexually transmitted disease? I don't think a 2 month old is actively having sex, unless it is the rape by the millions of real criminals we let into our borders, who don't have any shots whatsoever!</p> <p>Mercury, aluminum, stem parts, formaldehyde, &amp; a host of other things that don't stop the diseases, but weaken the children taking these unnecessary ingredients are destroying the health of millions of children and adults! We, along with the Western Civilization's Nations have the absolute highest rates of Autism in the world! Literally 600 times higher than other nations! Gee do you suppose it has</p>
--	---

	<p>something to do with the WHO, World Health Organization, run by a known terrorist? Or does it have something to do with the WEF, World Economic Forum, which is working its coup to Take One World Order control of our lives in every manner, including making all of our youth vulnerable, sick, and sterile at the same time? Or does it have anything to do with the UN Agenda 2030 in which they have publically made it clear that they want 2/3 of us gone?</p> <p>Are we simply playing into their hands to continue to dole out over 70 childhood vaccines, to render our children sick, full of allergies, autism, seizures, and a host of other illnesses and side effects?</p> <p>How can we trust any one of you to make any solid and safe decisions, when up to now, you have promoted our demise?</p> <p>Whether it is medical exemptions, religious exemptions, removing these exemptions, the conflicts of interest, by AAP, lobbyists, medical, or others, card tracking, or other edicts, the human factor seems to have been left out of the equation.</p> <p>We no longer have a "my body, my choice" in lieu of you seem to think you know what is best? Where were you when the seniors were left to die in homes, without medicines that would have saved their lives, like using ivermectin, or other known medicines, or stopping the use of ventilators when inhalers and oxygen could have helped, so that their lungs did not fill up with fluids, or their kidneys fail from remdesivir, or denying them their families as they lay dying, even though we all know the masks don't work, the 6ft. was a fake ruling by a Genocidal Monster? There is enough shame, and blame, to go around. But you all were supposed to know better, and the forced and mandatory nature of our institutions, based on international criminal organizations, is actually not forgivable. The information is tragic, with so many people paralyzed, palsies, myocarditis, turbo cancers, and many other life-changing, and deadly impacts!!!!</p> <p>The methods of your plans, include coercive tactics, tracking plans, medical lobbying for medical/pharma which stands to make big bucks! I THOUGHT COLORADO WAS A CHOICE STATE?</p>
--	--

	<p>This is more like tyranny, not a free republic in every way. When did you become a tool of the Medical Industrial Complex, rather than serving the people?</p> <p>The Infant Immunization Program and Immunization is not just flawed. It is criminal! I am asking you to stop it all at this point, and ASK FOR A TRUE INVESTIGATION AND COMMITTEE TO EXPOSE AND LET THE PUBLIC SEE THE TRUE NATURE OF THESE PROCEDURES PERFORMED ON INNOCENT BABIES, CHILDREN, AND ADULTS. I AM ASKING FOR ABSOLUTE DISCLOSURE OF ALL OF THE INGREDIENTS YOU ALL ARE FORCING INTO THE BODIES OF CHILDREN, WHEN OUR BODIES WERE MADE TO HAVE NATURAL IMMUNITY, THAT IS, UNTIL WE WERE POISONED BY SO MANY TOXINS, AND LIFE ALTERING WEAPONS.</p> <p>I AM FURTHER ASKING, DEMANDING, THAT THIS SET OF CHANGES, ALONG WITH ANY OTHERS BE STOPPED, AND REASSESSED IN THE NAME OF REAL SCIENCE, AND FULL DISCLOSURE TO THE PUBLIC, FROM WHOM ALL OF THESE AGENCIES RECEIVE THEIR COMPENSATION.</p> <p>THIS IS A NATIONAL CRISIS, AND THIS IS A NATIONAL SECURITY, AND FURTHER, THIS NEEDS TO BE TAKEN UP ON A NATIONAL LEVEL, AND OUR CONGRESS ALSO NEEDS TO BE MADE AWARE OF THIS DANGER.</p> <p>IF THIS IS NOT DONE, WE WONT HAVE A NEXT GENERATION OF HEALTHY HUMANS. IS THIS WHAT YOU ALL WANT? WELL, WE THE PEOPLE DO NOT WANT TO BE THE PREY, (DR. BREGGIN) AND WE DO NOT WANT TO BE THE GUINEA PIGS, THE PETRY DISHES, OR DR. FAUCI'S "BEAGLES."</p> <p>COVID: WHAT WENT WRONG? DR. DAVID MARTIN – Documenting Coronavirus Gain of Function Research at the Covid Summit in Brussels, Belgium – May 2023</p> <p>NATURE was hijacked in the name of "SCIENCE" based on the malleable COV model and subject to UNETHICAL GAIN OF FUNCTION manipulation.</p>
--	--

	<p>“SCIENCE” was hijacked by government agencies for defense and civilian commercial gain (Fauci’s pursuit of a “Universal Vaccine”) with no MORAL oversight.</p> <p>MORALITY was hijacked to coerce a population to accept a “Medical Counter Measure” under the illusion of “doing your part to help humanity.</p> <p>HUMANITY was hijacked to acquiesce to losing liberty without any consent!</p> <p>NO ONE SHOULD BE GIVEN BUSINESS TO CORPORATIONS WITHOUT THEM BEING HELD ACCOUNTABLE FOR HARM- SUCH AS PFIZER, MODERNA &amp; ALL OTHERS KNOWING HUMAN HARM, YET PUSHING IT ON HUMANITY!</p> <p>DO THE RIGHT THING! STOP THIS!</p>
<p>Lindsay Vargas Against themselves</p>	<p>I am adamantly against this bill. When anything says, “there is no liability” there should always be choice in the matter and not coercion. Following guidelines of entities that have a profit in the matter and are more than slightly biased does not sit well with me or many of my fellow citizens. Before all these mandates are imposed, please continue to seek and reference studies that have true controlled groups with an actual placebo and not just another form of vaccination before pushing all of these rules and requirements on the public.</p>
<p>Andee Newton Against themselves</p>	<p>Dear Colorado DHS representatives. I am against SB26-032. The reason I oppose this bill is because it does not clarify who is responsible for a vaccine injured individual.</p> <p>Furthermore, SB26-032 shifts the immunizations requirements to the American Academy of Pediatrics instead of the Advisory Committee for Immunization Practices. Pediatricians roles should be to serve their clients when needed, not to make recommendations to the whole state of Colorado. Especially in light of the fact that our medical system has neglected to provide true healing, but instead have helped propel chronic diseases as they continue to rise in</p>

	<p>percentages per children population. Thank you for your attention to this matter.</p>
<p>John Doss Against themselves</p>	<p>Mr. Kennedy has long been a champion for Progressive/Democratic rights and ideals. He is doing so again by following the science and letting parents be informed on how to vaccinate their kids. We should not follow a special interest group (AAP) whose main interest is money for their members.</p> <p>Thank you</p>
<p>Luca Chinello Against themselves</p>	<p>I OPPOSE SB 32 because it creates a system by which Colorado can ignore the federal Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP) vaccine recommendations from the process of creating state vaccines rules and requirements. This backlash is because the federal public health agencies run by HHS Secretary Robert F. Kennedy Jr. are increasing vaccine schedule safety and transparency and removing some vaccines from the CDC-recommended schedule based on new ACIP recommendations that have determined certain vaccines could be unsafe or ineffective in certain populations.</p> <p>When the CDC removes a vaccine from the recommended childhood vaccine schedule, based on ACIP recommendations, a process is started where the vaccine could no longer be covered by the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program established by the federal law 42 U.S.C. §§300aa-1 to 300aa-34 the "National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986" and the vaccine administrator and manufacturer would no longer have liability protection for damages caused by the vaccine. By removing ACIP recommendations from the sole basis of vaccine laws in state statute and creating an independent state vaccine recommendation process through the State Board of Health, the State Department of Public Health and Environment can continue to recommend that children receive vaccines that have been found to not meet the federal criteria for universal use recommendations and these recommendations form the basis of state laws for school and childcare vaccine requirements. Through this bill, the state extends liability protection to vaccine administrators who administer vaccines that may have been removed from the CDC-recommended schedule due to being determined by the ACIP to be unsafe or ineffective. This increases the risk of injury and even death for children in the state of Colorado. While I support the right of states to make their own health policy, that support ends</p>



where any level of government is mandating that an individual be vaccinated in general or as a condition of receiving any sort of benefit, access, or participation. Vaccines, just like all pharmaceutical products, carry a risk of injury and even death and should not be required by any public or private entity.

Additionally, I oppose this bill because it authorizes pharmacists to prescribe vaccinations for individuals without a physician's approval. The pharmacist does not have the individuals complete medical history, including any family medical history or potential contraindications to vaccination that would increase the risk of injury for that individual. Also, a pharmacist is not a medically trained professional with the knowledge or skill required to identify a life-threatening vaccine reaction that may occur at the time of administration and act accordingly to save the individual's life. Authorizing pharmacists to prescribe vaccines unnecessarily increases the risk of vaccine injury to the people of Colorado. Vaccines are abundantly available at doctors' offices, health departments, urgent cares, hospitals, and other medical clinics for those who wish to receive them, they do not need to be prescribed at the pharmacy.

I am also opposed to this bill because of the conflicts of interest that it sets up. It is especially concerning that this bill opens the door for Colorado to take vaccine recommendations from medical trade groups whose purpose is to further the business interests and profits of their members. It is inappropriate for these trade groups to have a state sanctioned say in which vaccines are on the schedule because these recommendations translate to directly to vaccine mandates. I am opposed to all vaccine mandates, regardless of what entity recommends the vaccines that are the subject of those mandates. Each of the groups that are mentioned by name in the bill have received funding from the vaccine industry and/or collaborated with it directly:

\* AAP - has multiple corporate donors listed on its website, including Pfizer, Moderna, Merck, Sanofi, and more.

\* AAFP - has received "an unrestricted grant from Seqirus USA Inc." for clinical resources regarding vaccines.

	<p>* ACOG - has multiple corporate donors listed on its website, including CSL Seqirus.</p> <p>* ACP - announced a collaboration in 2014 with Pfizer on a program "to increase adult immunization rates by assisting physicians and other health care providers in strongly recommending appropriate vaccination and tracking adult immunization rates for quality measurement and improvement."</p> <p>These entities cannot be trusted to provide unbiased recommendations regarding vaccination.</p> <p>The government should not be involved in personal decisions regarding vaccination at any level. I am opposed to all vaccine mandates and support the individual's right to informed consent, which includes the right to refuse a vaccine without harassment, coercion, or penalty. Vaccines, just like all pharmaceutical products, carry a risk of injury and even death.</p>
<p>Carolyn Bninski Against themselves</p>	<p>I urge you to vote against SB26-032, "Promoting Immunization Access".</p> <p>Before giving you my reasons for asking you to oppose this bill, I wanted to ask you a few important questions: Will you personally be responsible when children are injured by non-ACIP approved vaccines? Have you looked into the American Academy of Pediatrics' history of financial conflicts of interests in regard to the childhood vaccine schedule? Did you know that government-mandated medical interventions violate basic principles of bodily autonomy and ethical medical practice? Have you looked into the training that pharmacists receive for vaccinating children and found it to be adequate to ensure the safety of the children in the event of adverse events? Have you looked into the adverse events and deaths from vaccines in the Vaccine Adverse Events Reporting System (VAERS)?</p> <p>These are the reasons I am asking you to oppose SB26-032.</p> <p>1. Removing ACIP as the standard lets state agencies require vaccines on their own—even when those vaccines don't meet federal safety</p>

	<p>standards—making it easier for mandates to expand without proper oversight or accountability.</p> <p>2. This bill shields vaccine providers from liability—even when administering vaccines removed from the CDC schedule for safety or effectiveness concerns—leaving Colorado children exposed to risk with no meaningful accountability if harm occurs.</p> <p>3. Individuals vary in genetics, immune function, age, and health history, which is why medical decisions—including vaccination—must remain personal and voluntary.</p> <p>4. Medical trade organizations named in SB 32 have financial relationships with vaccine manufacturers, creating conflicts of interest when their recommendations are used to justify mandates.</p> <p>5. The American Academy of Pediatrics is facing serious allegations that it operates under undisclosed pharmaceutical influence, prioritizing industry interests over independent pediatric judgment—raising deep concerns about conflicts of interest, transparency, and trust in its recommendations.</p> <p>6. Allowing pharmacists to vaccinate is dangerous: they are not properly trained to recognize vaccine injuries or adverse reactions, often lack access to full patient histories, and may not have the lifesaving equipment or clinical support needed in an emergency—turning medical decision-making into a high-risk, retail transaction.</p> <p>7. Government-mandated medical interventions violate basic principles of bodily autonomy and ethical medical practice.</p> <p>8. As of 1/2/2026, there were 2,704,889 adverse events and 50,287 deaths reported to the federal Vaccine Adverse Events Reporting</p>
--	--

	<p>System (VAERS). Vaccines, just like all pharmaceutical products, carry a risk of injury and even death.</p> <p>Please vote against SB26-032</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Carolyn Brinski</p>
<p>Bethany Riggs Against themselves</p>	<p>I oppose this bill on vaccination because it goes against parental rights and choosing what is best for your child's health and safety.</p>