

From: Kate Hebel <kate@newedition-inc.com>

Sent: Thursday, December 19, 2019 7:00 PM

To: Kelley, Pattie (CI-StPaul) <pattie.kelley@ci.stpaul.mn.us>

Cc: #CI-StPaul_Ward3 <Ward3@ci.stpaul.mn.us>

Subject: Re: Ordinance 19-76 Amending Chapter 199 of the St. Paul Legislative Code pertaining to rabies control

Pattie,

Please make sure my letter, as well as this email is included for public comments/records; one never knows the weather in the middle of January. If possible I will try to attend.

I posted this information on the website Nextdoor.com to inform the 23 neighborhoods that this subject was planned to be discussed and the present rules changed. There were a few people who immediately posted, and they raised some very legitimate concerns....some of their dogs with pre-existing conditions, e.g. lupus, and even allergies to the rabies vaccine. Administering could have serious consequences for these dogs.

I have a collie; that breed is being studied by the University of Washington as well as Clemson University for a serious autoimmune diseases called Dermatomyositis (referred to as DM). Her DNA has been tested, and the results indicate a very high likelihood, 92% of developing the disease. The cause of this disease is still being studied, but they know it's inherited and can be triggered by multiple factors, or stressors, but one of the primary is the administering of the rabies vaccine. There's only one vaccine that the breeder has used, so we know for sure that specific manufacturer does not trigger the disease, but it takes some work by me to find a local vet who has it. So I certainly would not want the Animal Control to vaccinate my dog; it could initiate a full blown case of DM (see photos below). I do have my dog vaccinated, but I hold my breath every three years, and one of these years, that vaccine will no longer be available. These pharmaceuticals firms are always merging, etc.

I'm sure Animal Control doesn't have this on their radar, or any of the council members. But these are serious concerns. Animal Control doesn't know the health of these dogs; a loose dog may have just lost their collar or had it removed by someone. No responsible owner lets their dog run, and from the billion dollar industry, they care deeply for their four legged family members. I understand the concern about releasing a dog without proof of vaccination by the Owner, but the following sentence could allow for a dog to be vaccinated without consent by the Owner.

Dogs, cats, or ferrets that were unvaccinated at the time of impoundment shall be vaccinated prior to release and the owner shall be charged with the cost of vaccination as provided in section 310.09(b) of the Legislative Code.

I don't believe the intent of the Council is to harm residents pets, but that could be a consequence when so much language is simply removed, without considering pets with pre-existing conditions.



Kate Hebel

*1301 Fairmount Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55105*

KATE HEBEL
1301 Fairmount Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55105
651-690-3441

TO: ST. PAUL CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS

RE: December 18, 2019 Meeting Agenda

ITEM: 40, Ord. 19-76 Amending Chapter 199 of the St. Paul Legislative Code
Pertaining to rabies control

I just read the proposed changes to the City's Ordinance Chapter 199 re: rabies control.

There is a phrase, planned to be struck in Section 199.08 Investigation that I believe needs to be clarified before adoption.

a) The rabies control authority, animal ~~warden~~ control officer or any police officer is authorized to enter any yard, ~~whether or not enclosed~~, or any open kennel in which a dog, cat or ferret is kept or harbored for the purpose of determining whether such dog, cat or ferret is wearing a valid rabies vaccination tag.

I am all for enforcing rabies vaccination, but the implication of striking the phrase "whether or not enclosed" concerns me. I see an 'accident waiting to happen'. Any dog, who is within it's fenced yard considers that property to be it's territory. Walking into that territory can have serious consequences, even for the most docile dog. It's happened in Minneapolis when a police office entered a fenced yard, uninvited by the owner, and ended up shooting the resident dog, all because he was defending his owner's property. I can feel for the police officer, but the dog doesn't know a officer from a felon. I also can't imagine the fear an officer feels when he believes he's going to be attacked. But who is in the wrong here? Even utility workers and mail carriers request that family dogs be removed from the fenced yard before entering.

I called St. Paul Animal Control, and spoke with Molly, the manager to understand the intent of removing the wording. She explained it was intended for a control officer or police officer to enter a fenced yard when they are pursuing an unleashed dog, but there is no such verbiage to indicate such. The way it's written it clearly states that "an animal control officer or any police officer is authorized to enter any yard, or any open kennel in which a dog, cat or ferret is kept or harbored; that implies the animal is within the confines of his Owner's property, the fenced yard, not an unidentified dog being chased by an officer.

I sincerely hope that the verbiage is revised to clearly indicate the intent of Animal Control, before an innocent dog is shot, or a police officer is hurt while pursuing an unleashed dog.

[Sign In](#)

[Live Meetings](#) [City Home](#) [Research](#) **[Legislation](#)** [Calendar](#) [City Council](#) [Boards or Commissions](#)



Details [Reports](#)

File #: Ord 19-76 Version: 1 Name: Amending Chapter 199 Rabies Vaccine
 Type: Ordinance Status: Second Reading
 In control: [City Council](#)
 Final action:
 Title: Amending Chapter 199 of the Saint Paul Legislative Code pertaining to rabies control.
 Sponsors: Amy Brendmoen
 Ward: Ward - all
 History (1) **Text** Public Comments (0)

Title
Amending Chapter 199 of the Saint Paul Legislative Code pertaining to rabies control.

Body
THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAINT PAUL DOES ORDAIN:

SECTION 1

Section 199.07 of the Saint Paul Legislative Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

Sec. 199.07. - Impoundment of dogs, cats and ferrets without valid rabies vaccination tags.

Any dog, cat or ferret found off the owner's premises and not wearing a valid rabies vaccination tag may be impounded. All impounded dogs, cats or ferrets shall be given proper care and maintenance. Impoundment of all animals shall be in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 200 of the Saint Paul Legislative Code. ~~No dog, cat, or ferret may be released to an owner from the Saint Paul Animal Control Center without a valid rabies vaccination. Dogs, cats, or ferrets that were unvaccinated at the time of impoundment shall be vaccinated prior to release and the owner shall be charged with the cost of vaccination as provided in section 310.09(b) of the Legislative Code. Each dog, cat or ferret impounded pursuant to this section shall be kept at least five (5) days after the impoundment thereof, unless conditionally reclaimed by its owner as herein provided. Any dog, cat or ferret which is impounded pursuant to this section may be conditionally reclaimed by its owner by payment of the fees prescribed in Chapter 200 and by compliance with the rabies vaccination requirements of this chapter within seventy two (72) hours of release. Upon claiming any dog, cat or ferret which has not previously been vaccinated, the owner shall deposit the sum of twenty six dollars (\$26.00) with the animal control supervisor, which deposit shall be refunded upon the owner filing proof that the dog, cat or ferret has been vaccinated within seventy two (72) hours of release; otherwise the deposit shall be forfeited to the city.~~ If the owner of a dog, cat or ferret impounded because of the absence of a valid rabies vaccination tag claims that his or her animal has been vaccinated, such owner may reclaim his or her dog, cat or ferret upon production of proof of vaccination, payment of all impounding fees, and proof of a valid rabies vaccination tag. If a dog, cat or ferret impounded pursuant to this section is unclaimed by its owner at the end of five (5) days, such animal may be disposed of in accordance with provisions of section 200.13 of the Saint Paul Legislative Code.

SECTION 2

Section 199.08 of the Saint Paul Legislative Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

Sec. 199.08. - Investigation.

- (a) The rabies control authority, animal ~~warden~~ control officer or any police officer is authorized to enter any yard, ~~whether or not enclosed~~, or any open kennel in which a dog, cat or ferret is kept or harbored for the purpose of determining whether such dog, cat or ferret is wearing a valid rabies vaccination tag.
- (b) The rabies control authority, animal ~~warden~~ control officer or any police officer, having reasonable cause to believe a health hazard exists by virtue of an owner's noncompliance with the provisions of this chapter, is authorized to apply to the appropriate authority as otherwise permitted by law for a warrant empowering him to enter the dwelling, residence or place of abode of the owner of a dog, cat or ferret and to demand the exhibition by the owner of such dog, cat or ferret and/or rabies vaccination tag and/or rabies vaccination certificate.

SECTION 3

This ordinance shall take effect and be in force thirty (30) days following its passage, approval and publication.