

**From:** Kate Hebel <[kate@newedition-inc.com](mailto:kate@newedition-inc.com)>

**Sent:** Monday, January 13, 2020 11:07 AM

**To:** #CI-StPaul\_Ward7 <[Ward7@ci.stpaul.mn.us](mailto:Ward7@ci.stpaul.mn.us)>; #CI-StPaul\_Ward1 <[Ward1@ci.stpaul.mn.us](mailto:Ward1@ci.stpaul.mn.us)>

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

I realize on Wednesday this subject is up for public hearing, but I really don't believe most of the St. Paul City residents know anything about it, or how it may impact their families.

Jay Kolls of KSTP reached out (apparently he receives the City Council agenda in advance also) and requested my thoughts and more importantly concerns. I have several, but the most important, financial impact to a family, especially a low income family. I believe most pet owners are loving responsible owners, but sometimes dogs get loose ...one of kids leave the gate open; a worker, or just a loose gate. I don't believe residents should be penalized, and to me the financial impact of the proposal is just that.

I'm sending you the link to the video; I request that you watch it and listen to what I'm trying to caution.  
<https://kstp.com/news/st-paul-city-council-rabies-vaccine-impound-fee/5606622/?cat=1>

I am also greatly concerned about the wording of Section 2, Section 199.08 Investigation

#### [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.

No where in this paragraph does it state that the dog is being pursued or is exhibiting unusual behavior indicating a serious medical condition. It simply states that an animal control office can come into a fenced yard, uninvited to check any resident dog for a rabies tag!

1. I believe this is unconstitutional and a far overreach.
2. The yard is fenced for a reason ...to keep the dog in, and strangers out.
3. The yard is the dog's territory and most dogs will protect its owner's property.
4. Many owners do not have collars on their dogs when they're not tethered to a leash or lead.
5. Entering a private fenced yard is potentially dangerous to the dog, as well as the officer.

I see the Proposal also wants the residents to pay for microchipping. Microchipping is based on a database of addresses. After the animal is registered, and once the Owner moves from that address it is

highly improbably that the Owner will continually update the microchip database; therefore microchipping is useless and moot.

I think the City is **again** overextending its jurisdiction all in hopes of finding another revenue stream, based on penalizing its residents!

I would suggest that for those Owners who may habitually allow their dog to run, that you set up a staggered systems of fines or fees, similar to the false alarm fines.

Example: Impound #1, a low fee; Impound #2, higher, and Impound #3 a fine with some teeth.

I hope you will seriously consider how this proposal could impact the residents in your Ward and bring it up for discussion in your meeting Wednesday.

*Kate Hebel*

*1301 Fairmount Avenue  
St. Paul, MN 55105*