

RECEIVED

March 12, 2007

2007 MAR 19 AM 11:01

Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture
Bureau of Dog Law Enforcement
ATTN: Ms. Mary Bender
2301 North Cameron Street
Harrisburg, PA 17110-9408

INDEPENDENT REGULATORY
REVIEW COMMISSION

**RE: Regulation ID # 2-152 (#2559)
Dog Law Regulations**

Dear Ms. Bender:

The following comments are submitted on behalf of the Central Pennsylvania Animal Alliance (CPAA), a coalition of individuals and over 50 shelter and rescue groups in the Central Pennsylvania area. CPAA is committed to ending the killing of dogs and cats as the means of animal population control through aggressive spay/neuter programs, adoptions, and public outreach and education. Our comments on the Proposed Amendments to the Pennsylvania Dog Law Regulations at Title 7 of the Pennsylvania Code are as follows:

Section 21.3— Enforcement and Compliance

This section is not broad enough. We recommend that State Police Officers and Humane Society Police officers be included as being able to enforce the provisions of the regulations. Adding these individuals would be especially important in an egregious cruelty situation where immediate action was needed and an employee of the Department of Agriculture (“Department”) could not be reached. It would thus be reasonable to include the State Police and Humane Society Police Officers in this provision to ensure better protection for the animals. Other sections of the regulations allow police officers and state dog wardens to seize animals, so we suggest that these individuals be permitted to enforce the regulations.

Section 21.4— Penalties

(1) (iii) This section would be impossible to enforce. There is no way to determine whether an establishment transfers a cumulative total of 26 dogs in any one calendar year other than through the word of the establishment.

(1)(iv) This section appears to be contradictory. First, the section states that the Secretary shall revoke or not issue a kennel license to a person convicted of animal cruelty. It then goes on to state that the Secretary may revoke, suspend, or refuse to issue a kennel license if the person holding or applying for the license has been convicted of animal cruelty more than ten years ago. Section (1)(iv)(E). We recommend that this section be consistent with the “shall” language in Section 1(iv). This would prevent abusers who cannot become licensed in other states from coming to Pennsylvania to obtain licenses and would thus better protect the welfare of the animals.

(1)(v) (B) Return of seized dog

This section is not reasonable. This section allows a person whose license has been REVOKED to get the dog back if he provides the Department with “adequate assurances” that the dog will receive veterinary care. It is not reasonable to allow someone whose license has been revoked to get a seized dog back. Further, “adequate assurances” is not defined and is ambiguous. We suggest that the seized animal be placed in the care of a veterinarian and that the individual be required to pay for the necessary veterinary care and rehabilitation for the dog. We also suggest that the individual be made to comply with all inspection standards and be required to have his license reinstated before getting any seized animal back.

(iv)(C) Again, this section is not reasonable. If a person’s kennel license has been revoked, suspended, or denied, then the minimum standards for the care of animals have not been met. Why would animals be permitted to remain in this person’s care merely upon satisfactory evidence or assurances? And, satisfactory evidence or assurances is not defined and is ambiguous. What exactly does this mean? Is it merely the person’s word—the person whose license has been revoked? That is not sufficient to protect the dogs’ welfare. We suggest that animals not be permitted to remain in the care of an individual whose license has been revoked. See our comment to “Return of seized dog” above.

(vi)(B) Secretary directed forfeiture

There is a word missing in the second line. We believe it should read “the secretary may direct that ownership of a particular dog which has been seized...”

Section 21.14 Kennel Licensure Provisions

(a)(3)(ii) This section would group kennels, commercial breeders, rescue organizations, and foster homes together and subject them to the same requirements. It is unclear how the required reporting by a rescue organization that does not maintain a centralized facility will take place and be monitored. This provision is not enforceable in a consistent manner. Most rescue organizations are operated on a “foster only” basis and have no centralized physical kennel.

This provision is unreasonable as it applies to foster homes that are utilized by rescue organizations. Dogs that are placed in foster care are kept in a home environment just as owned dogs are. The foster dogs are the “temporary” pets kept by a household until the animal finds its forever home. These animals are not crated or kept in kennel-like conditions. Instead, the animals are kept inside, in a home environment. It is unreasonable to hold a home situation to the same standards as a commercial kennel or breeding facility. Foster homes utilized by rescues provide more humane living conditions for the animals cared for by rescues, as the animals are indoors, socialized, and become housebroken. It would not be in the best interest of the animals to require the foster homes to place animals in a kennel environment instead allowing them to live inside a home.

The purpose of these revised regulations was ostensibly to better regulate the abhorrent and egregious conditions of Pennsylvania's puppy mills. Extending the regulation to include kennel based rescue agencies and foster homes does nothing to further regulate the puppy millers, and in fact, would arguably impose standards upon private individuals that they would be unable to meet, forcing them to close down, thereby jeopardizing the lives of the tens of thousands of animals assisted by rescues each year. These animals would be placed into the system for municipalities and shelters to handle in an already overburdened system. And, the cost to taxpayers would increase due to municipalities having to handle animals previously handled by rescues. Rescues serve an important function—they are volunteerism at its finest. They help animals with no cost to the taxpayers, and aid the state-wide economy by giving veterinarians tremendous business, and well as the pet stores, for food and supplies. Thus, putting the rescues out of business--as the regulations would do--would have a far reaching impact on taxpayers and the state-wide economy. We recommend that kennel and foster based rescues be exempt from the provisions of these regulations, and the regulations should have a clear provision stating the exemption.

We also question the constitutionality of this provision which would allow entry into a private home without a warrant. The regulatory provisions for entry into a private home would adequately cover the foster home care situation. Non-kennel based rescues and foster home care situations should not be encompassed by these regulations.

In addition, registering private homes that offer foster care as kennels would put an undue burden on individuals who live in residential areas, since many zoning ordinances regulate where a kennel may be located. The location of all kennel license recipients in Pennsylvania is published on the internet and in other public forums. This publication of information about the homes of individuals presents a privacy concern.

Section 21.23 Space

(a) It is impossible for a dog to be in an enclosure in a lateral encumbrance with legs fully extended without touching any side of the enclosure. The crate or kennel would have to be huge for even a medium sized dog, and astronomically sized for a huge dog. We suggest that space requirements be proportionate based upon the size of the dog.

(e)(v) This provision would be impossible to enforce, as the inspector will have to rely merely upon records kept, which could easily be falsified.

Section 21.24 Shelter housing facilities and primary enclosures

(a) Structurally sound needs to be clarified. An enclosure could be structurally sound but be insufficient to protect the dog from the cold—*i.e.* a plastic igloo type dog house could be structurally sound but does not provide sufficient insulation to keep the dog warm in the winter or cool in the summer. We suggest that outdoor facilities be required to contain straw or hay for the dogs' warmth during the winter months.

(b) Outdoor Housing Facilities

How will this provision be enforced? Will the kennel owner's word be enough? We suggest that the specific breeds that would not tolerate the cold weather be specifically listed as not to be kept in outdoor facilities, and the same specific list for breeds that are intolerant of the heat. At least then the inspector will have a specific list to go by when the kennel is inspected. In addition, we suggest that a veterinarian certificate be required for each dog maintained at the kennel to verify that it may be kept outside.

(b.1) We recommend that shade be defined to require protection from the sun.

We recommend that the following be added to the regulations:

- Female dogs may not be bred until they are at least two years old, and that they may not be bred more than once per year.
- There should be definite breeding limitations on the commercial kennels if Pennsylvania is ever going to end the killing of dogs and cats as the means of animal population control. Every dog that a commercial kennel breeds undoes the hard work that rescues due to spay and neuter the animals under their care.
- Records must be kept on the breeding history of each dog and be subject to the review of the Department, State Police Officers, and Humane Society Police Officers.
- Commercial breeders must pay a license fee of \$5,000 or more per year if they breed more than 20 dogs per year.
- All dogs housed by commercial breeders must be spayed or neutered prior to sale.

Respectfully submitted,

CPAA Members

David J. Bennett
859 Acari RD
Mechanicsburg PA
17050

Zara Bennett
859 Acari RD
Mechanicsburg, Pa. 17050

JULIA BOWMAN - CPAA
Julia Bowman
830 BOSLER AVE
LEMOYNE, PA 17043

Michele Avery - CPAA
Michele Avery
830 Bosler Ave
Lemoyne PA 17043

Lynne Castro (CPAA Member)
6311 Maiden Creek Dr.
Harrisburg, PA 17111

Scott P. Kaeselau (CPAA member)
4922 Hamilton Dr
Harrisburg, PA 17109

Ronna Cramer
Le Mimosa Drive
Mechanicsburg, PA 17055

LISA GUEVARA
308 Beverly Road
Camp Hill, PA 17011

✓ cc: Arthur Coccodrilli, Chairman
Independent Regulatory Review Commission
333 Market Street, 14th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101

Governor Edward G. Rendell
225 Main Capitol Building
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Mary Jo McClain

Mary Jo McClain
4002 Ashburn Way
Mechanicsburg, PA 17055

Patricia A. Dravk - CPAA
321 Dorwart Circle
Ebers Pa. 17319
(717) 938-1191 pdravk@yahoo.com

Sonya Mink

Sonya Mink
2307 Jonoff Road
Harrisburg, PA 17110
Central Pennsylvania Animal Alliance

Jenny Achley

Jenny Achley
357 Thorley Rd
New Cumberland, PA 17020

mt Schwaner Rescue
Dogg Den
Central Pa Animal Alliance

Jim HARR

85 BRITANNY LANE
Dillsburg, PA
CANINE RESCUE OF CENTRAL PA

Paul L. Rice

902 LORNING LN
Mechanicsburg, PA
17055

CANINE RESCUE OF
CENTRAL Pa.

Dinda Houseal - CPAA member

6334 Bluestone Ave
Harrisburg, PA 17112

Deborah Smith

CPAH
1302 Upton Dr.
Harrisburg, PA 17110
717-783-4860
go veg 17110@yahoo.com

Jean Lee

PAWS
JEAN F. LEAR
824 Lee Lane
Enola, PA 17025
717-732-3961
JFL121@AOL.COM

Denise Burkay
The Dog's Den
127 SAN JO Drive
GRANTVILLE PA 17028
(717) 469-7325

DoggieDen@aol.com

Robin Scherer

Robin Scherer
Furry Friends Network
563 Mountain Road
Boiling Springs, PA 17016
furryfriendnet@aol.co
717-385-8219