

James F. Scharnberg  
 20 Beatty Lane, Malvern, PA 19355-8616  
 March 12, 2007

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

RECEIVED  
 2007 MAR 16 PM 1:42  
 INDEPENDENT REGULATORY  
 REVIEW COMMISSION

Dear Ms. Bender:

My name is James F. Scharnberg of 20 Beatty Lane, Malvern, Chester County, Pennsylvania. I am writing to comment on the proposed amendments to the Pennsylvania dog law regulations issued on December 16, 2006. I have been involved with hunting packs of Beagles and Basset Hounds as a master, huntsman and breeder for over 35 years in Chester County, Pennsylvania.

I believe that inhumane and substandard kennel conditions should not be tolerated, but I do not agree that most of the proposed regulatory changes are needed, or would necessarily have a beneficial outcome if adopted. Many are impractical, excessively burdensome and costly, unenforceable, and/or will not improve the quality of life for the dogs in these kennels.

**Examples of problems with the proposal are the following:**

The definition of "temporary housing" would require thousands of small residential hobby and show breeding households to become licensed which could not possibly comply with the regulations, and which there is no reason to regulate.

\* The obligations of owners of "temporary housing" which are made subject to inspection by the proposal are not enumerated or limited.

\* There is no scientific or accepted husbandry basis for the amended space and exercise requirements.

\* The regulations will require wholesale renovation, if not rebuilding, of many kennels already built in compliance with current federal and/or state standards. There is no scientific foundation for the arbitrary, rigid engineering standards specified.

\* Smaller breeders and dog owners who maintain their dogs in their own residential premises but are covered by the Pennsylvania dog law, who provide care and conditions far superior to those required by the proposed new standards, would be unable to comply with the rigid commercial kennel standards.


\* The record keeping requirements with respect to exercise, cleaning, and other aspects of kennel management are excessively burdensome and serve no useful purpose, as it would be impossible to verify their accuracy in all but the most egregious circumstances. Such egregious circumstances already violate existing regulations.

\* The proposals pertaining to housing and social interaction of dogs of different sizes are contrary to good husbandry, socialization and training practices.

The above is far from a complete list of the deficiencies with the proposed regulations. I also associate myself with the more detailed comments on this proposal by the Pennsylvania Federation of Dog Clubs.

The Bureau has tacitly conceded that its current regulations have not been adequately enforced. If, after implementing its recently announced enhanced enforcement program, the Bureau finds it is still unable to prevent inhumane treatment of dogs because of specific deficiencies in the existing regulations, it should cite these specific deficiencies and propose changes based on them. The current proposal appears to be merely a laundry list of ideas for improving the environment for dogs that has no connection to specific instances in which the welfare of dogs could not be secured, and no basis in science or accepted canine husbandry practices. I urge that this proposal be withdrawn.

Sincerely yours,

  
 James F. Scharnberg