

Lenzi, Chelsea

From: West Valley Vet <westvalleyvet@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, September 18, 2017 2:00 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Public Health Dept amended ordinance

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Supervisors,

This email will be brief as we have to have it to you before 2 pm and we were not given much notice. On Friday, Sept 15, we received a letter from Jan Glick, the Animal Services Director, informing us that they would be recommending to the Board of Supervisors, to amend and add a new section 7-18-7, certificate of Rabies Vaccination.

This letter was dated Sept 12, 2017, received on September 15, 2017 and the discussion on the amendment is on Sept 19, 2017. We are concerned about the lack of transparency in letting the veterinary community know. With such late notice, we have no time to discuss this and respond. If there is any possibility of extending the comment period on this proposed amendment, it would be much appreciated.

As far as the amendment goes, we have some issues with the reasons for this amendment. One of the reasons given for this change is to track dangerous & aggressive dogs. I would like to ask how this amendment is going to do that? These are not people who vaccinate their dogs in the first place, so no report would be given.

Another reason given is to provide id for lost pets to reunite them. That all sounds well and good, but unless these pets have a permanent id (microchip), chances are good the collar and tag will not be on the dog. This amendment would not ensure that more tags are actually on the pets, just that more pets would be licensed.

Protecting the health and safety of the public by ensuring dogs are vaccinated against rabies is yet another reason given. The Animal Control division already does that, and does a great job, as it was difficult for me to find any instance of a rabid dog from this county found in many years. We are most concerned that this amendment will actually cause people NOT to vaccinate their pets and thus, create more potential for a zoonotic problem. This is our biggest concern!

Reducing the number of unspayed pets is also one of the reasons. We already have ordinances in place requiring that to be done, so this reason is redundant.

So we come to the last reason given for this ordinance - providing necessary funding for the county. THAT is the real reason in our opinion. And you want the veterinarians to do it for you. We are already burdened with a lot of paperwork required by the state and spend a lot of staff time keeping that up to date. We do not want to be obligated to provide more paperwork to do, what should be, Animal Services' job. Will Animal Services be compensating us for the time required to provide this to them?

Will rescues be obligated to provide licenses for all of their animals? How will you decide if it is a valid rescue? Will vaccine clinics be obligated to provide the same information the veterinarians? Care 4 Paws, VIP? What happens to clients who have more than the "legal" number of pets? Will they be forced to give them up? If people think that will happen, less rabies vaccines will be given.

Please think carefully about your vote. Less rabies vaccines will be a public health hazard and that should be the primary goal of any ordinance. Please consider setting up a meeting with the veterinarians affected by this amendment, instead of by passing their input on such a matter.

Laurie Litwiler
Office Manager, West Valley Veterinary Clinic