



# City of Columbia, Missouri

## Meeting Minutes - Final

### Board of Health



---

Thursday, January 12, 2017  
5:30 PM

Regular

Department of Public  
Health and Human  
Services  
Training Room 1  
1005 W. Worley St.

---

#### I. CALL TO ORDER

The Columbia/Boone County Board of Health met for a regularly scheduled meeting at 5:30 p.m., Thursday, January 12, 2017, at the Columbia/Boone County Department of Public Health and Human Services. Public Health and Human Services (PHHS) Assistant Director Scott Clardy represented the staff. Janet Thompson represented the Boone County Commission. Dianna Ledgerwood, Administrative Support Assistant, recorded the minutes of the meeting.

After determining there was a quorum, Dr. Szewczyk called the meeting to order at 5:37 p.m.

**Present:** 7 - Cynthia Boley, Elizabeth Hussey, Jean Sax, Mahree Skala, David Sohl, Denise Stillson and Michael Szewczyk

**Excused:** 4 - Harry Feirman, Sally Lyon, Colin Malaker and Lynelle Phillips

#### II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

There were no changes to the agenda and it was approved as presented.

**A motion was made by Dr. Szewczyk, seconded by Dr. Beth Hussey, and carried the agenda be approved as presented.**

#### III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Dr. Szewczyk discussed the content of the minutes and the amount of detail that should be in the minutes. Discussion followed. Scott Clardy advised that staff was striving to make the minutes reflect essential discussion and subsequent recommendations while being more reflective of the minutes from all City meetings. This is a work in progress and should become more consistent.

**There being no corrections to the minutes, the motion was made by Dr. Hussey, seconded by Ms. Sax, and carried that the minutes be approved as presented.**

November 10, 2016 Minutes - DRAFT

Attachments: [November 10, 2016 Minutes-DRAFT](#)

#### IV. REPORTS

##### Director's Report

Scott Clardy reported the mumps outbreak has still been an issue for department staff. There are 302 cases associated with Mizzou, and 334 total reflecting other people who came into contact with students. Student Health is offering a third dose of MMR and they are recommending that students receive the third dose. PHHS is also offering the third dose. In addition, we have been making preparations for the impending ice storm. It was noted that the CDC is not recommending the third MMR. Mr. Clardy advised CDC is following the guidelines of American Committee on Immunizations Practices which has not recommended a third dose.

##### County Commissioner Report

Janet Thompson advised that the County, like the City, has been discussing the possibility of participating in the Saint Louis County Prescription Drug Monitoring Program. At this point, it is at a very preliminary stage. Dr. Szewczyk asked if the municipalities in the County would then be covered as part of the County's participation. Ms. Thompson said county government covers only unincorporated areas.

One of the initiatives the County is pursuing is the establishment of a 24/7 comprehensive crisis center that would include emergency housing. Ms. Thompson also noted that the County will host the president of the National Association of Counties for a meeting in early February.

##### Legislative Update

Scott Clardy reported over 500 bills have been filed so far. As far as Public Health issues, some are the same issues we saw last year such as modifying nurse practitioner collaborative practice arrangements, repealing motorcycle helmet laws, and a couple versions of a Prescription Drug Monitoring Program bill. However, no action has been taken yet. They are working first on some of the GOP priorities such as Right To Work, with two or three hearings already being held on this issue.

#### V. OLD BUSINESS

##### Tobacco Retailer Licensure

**Attachments:** [Szewczyk handout - FDA](#)

Dr. Szewczyk referred to the revised draft report he prepared on behalf of the Board for the City Council concerning the adoption of a Tobacco Retailer Licensing Program. There have been some changes from the November document. There was discussion on minor changes to be made.

Dr. Szewczyk will make those revisions and send the report on to the City Council.

Prescription Drug Monitoring Program

**Attachments:** [Clardy handout - Addiction flyer](#)

Scott Clardy reported the department is working with the City's legal department, looking at other ordinances that have been passed to see how the City of Columbia can use some of the same language. Stephanie Browning is working on getting some dates for information sessions to meet with physicians, pharmacists, and other interested parties to answer questions and discuss any concerns. If Columbia can pass an ordinance and sign a data user agreement by the end of March, the data collection will start in April and summary reports would begin around the middle of July.

Scott Clardy presented a flyer provided by Friends of Senator Holly Rehdner encouraging citizens to join the fight against addiction.

## VI. NEW BUSINESS

Animal Control - Cat Bites, Impoundment and Licenses

**Attachments:** [Clardy handout - Questions to Board](#)

[Clardy handout - Ordinance](#)

[Clardy handout - Animal Licensing estimates](#)

[Clardy handout - US pet ownership statistics](#)

[Clardy handout - US pet ownership statistics 2](#)

The following documents were distributed for reference during discussion:

Questions posed to the Board of Health regarding animal licensing; Columbia MO Code of Ordinances Sec. 5-3. - Disposition of animals biting or attacking persons; Columbia Estimated Cat Licensing Data; AVMA statistics on U.S. Pet Ownership Statistics.

Dr. Szewczyk presented a list of questions posed to the Board from Councilman Ian Thomas regarding animal licensing.

Those questions are:

(A) Is there any value in the City requiring cat owners to buy a license? (estimates suggest only 2% of cats are licensed versus about 10% for dogs; also most cat owners do not realize they need to have a license)

(B) Is there a reason to make "cats roaming" an offense? (most cats, including those owned by very responsible owners, roam in their backyards and neighborhoods and I am not aware of any problems they cause - unlike dogs, which do cause problems when they roam)

(C) When a cat bites someone, is it reasonable to disqualify the owner from "in-home impoundment" because (i) the cat is not licensed, and/or (ii) the cat roams?

Scott Clardy introduced Animal Control Supervisor Molly Aust. To facilitate a response to Councilman Thomas' questions, the Board reviewed the ordinance which defines the disposition of animals biting or attacking persons, with special focus on Sec. 5-3 (d). The ordinance requires that cats or dogs that bite a person need to be impounded for 10 days. If seven out of seven requirements are met, at the discretion of the Animal Control Officer, this impoundment can occur at the animal's home. Each requirement that had to be met to qualify for home impoundment was reviewed and discussed by the board. Members then voted on whether the requirement should be kept, modified or removed. The seven requirements are:

1. The animal has been vaccinated against rabies.
2. The animal was properly licensed by the city at the time of the incident.
3. Neither the animal nor any other animal kept at the owner's residence has a history of running at large.
4. The animal does not have a history of causing injury to any person or Animal.
5. The animal's owner authorizes animal control officers to monitor the animal's condition for ten (10) days.
6. The animal's owner agrees to have the animal examined by a veterinarian on the tenth day of impoundment.
7. No one is being charged with a violation of section 5-57 involving the animal to be impounded (dangerous animal).

The board unanimously agreed that requirement #2, that the dog or cat be

licensed in order to qualify for home observation, was unnecessary. Animal Control noted that originally this was included to serve as perk for those who were compliant with obtaining a license. The Board felt there was no health related reason to keep this requirement.

The board unanimously agreed to keep all the other requirements with a slight modification of #6, the requirement that a veterinarian check the animal on the tenth day. In the past, some owners have disputed who should pay for the veterinarian exam. It was suggested that the ordinance make clear by revising the requirement to say:

“The animal’s owner agrees to have the animal examined by a veterinarian, *at the owner’s expense*, on the tenth day of impoundment.”

The Board also recognized that there was a question about requirement #3, why dogs and cats that have “a history of running at large” should be denied home impoundment. It was noted that any cat or dog that is allowed to run at large has the potential of coming in contact with wild animals that are infected with rabies. Dr. Hussey noted that even if a dog or cat is properly vaccinated, for any specific animal, it is not known whether or not that animal is truly protected against rabies. Animal antibody titers are not checked and, in some, the rabies vaccine may not be effective. Roaming dogs and cats can find and be exposed to rabid animals including bats. Given the fact that rabies is 100% lethal, professional impoundment during the observation period is recommended.

The Board reviewed cat and dog licensing data and discussed the purpose of licensing. As originally intended, licensing was implemented to promote rabies vaccinations. An owner could not obtain a license unless the vaccination was up to date. Given the low rate of compliance with the licensing, that is clearly not the case. Most individuals have their pet vaccinated and just don’t bother to obtain the license. In addition, it was felt that licensing would help animal control find the owner of a lost animal, as long as a tag was on its collar. Board members noted that cats are more like other pets that are kept at home such as ferrets, rabbits and guinea pigs which are not licensed. Dogs, on the other hand, are walked and interact with other dogs and humans outside the home. Lost dogs are more likely to interact with, and potentially bite, other dogs and humans. The City expends funds on park areas specifically designated for dogs. Given these considerations, the Board felt that dogs should continue to be licensed and cat licensing should be discontinued.

The Board discussed the causes of poor compliance with dog licensing. Many dog owners are not aware of the requirement and not all veterinarians promote licensing. In addition, licenses expire in one or three

years (based on the type of rabies vaccination the dog receives). Many owners may initially opt for the license but not on a yearly basis. The Board believes compliance could be improved through better owner education regarding the licensing requirement and the availability to purchase the license directly from the City. Several board members felt that a one-time fee of \$75 would be reasonable.

Dr. Szewczyk will prepare a communication to the City Council regarding the Board's Animal Control recommendations.

**VII. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, MEMBERS AND STAFF**

None

**VIII. NEXT MEETING DATE**

Thursday, February 9th, 2017 at 5:30 p.m.

**IX. ADJOURNMENT**

**The motion was made by Jean Sax, seconded by Dr. Hussey, and approved that the meeting be adjourned at 7:25 p.m.**

Members of the public may attend any open meeting. For requests for accommodations related to disability, please call 573-874-7214. In order to assist staff in making the appropriate arrangements for your accommodation, please make your request as far in advance of the posted meeting date as possible.