

Note: Email completed form to jcarr1@jcarr.state.oh.us.

Hearing Date: 2/14/2018

Today's Date: 2/28/2018

Agency: Ohio Department of Health

Rule Number(s): 3701-3-02, 3701-3-29

If no comments at the hearing, please check the box. ☐

List organizations or individuals giving or submitting testimony before, during or after the public hearing and indicate the rule number(s) in question.

1. Jennifer Frazier, R.S., Franklin County Public Health, Rule 3701-3-29
2. Aaron K. Messer, BS, DVM, RS, REHS, MPH, Columbus Public Health, Rule 3701-3-29
3. Click here to enter text.
4. Click here to enter text.
5. Click here to enter text.
6. Click here to enter text.
7. Click here to enter text.
8. Click here to enter text.
9. Click here to enter text.
10. Click here to enter text.
11. Click here to enter text.
12. Click here to enter text.
13. Click here to enter text.
14. Click here to enter text.
15. Click here to enter text.
16. Click here to enter text.

Hearing Summary Report

Consolidated Summary of Comments Received

Please review all comments received and complete a consolidated summary paragraph of the comments and indicate the rule number(s).

Ms. Frazier requested that in O.A.C. 3701-3-29 A (1) and throughout where it is indicated that the health district in which the bite or exposure occurred would be responsible for issuing quarantine and verifying the condition of the biting animal, that we change the language to indicate that the jurisdiction in which the owner of the biting animal resides would be responsible.

Dr. Messer was concerned that in O.A.C. 3701-3-29, regarding serological monitoring, the revisions risk creating confusion as to what are best practices and potentially create doubt between veterinary clients and veterinarians using currently accepted veterinary practices that pets receive regular booster rabies vaccinations. He requested that we add language requiring that serological testing be mandated in the first and all subsequent cases whereby a dog or cat is exposed to a confirmed or suspected rabid animal in order to reduce quarantine period.

Hearing Summary Report

Incorporated Comments into Rule(s)

Indicate how comments received during the hearing process were incorporated into the rule(s).
If no comments were incorporated, explain why not.

Comments were not incorporated.

While it does make sense to have coordination between the jurisdiction where the bite occurred and the jurisdiction where the biting animal resides, we don't always know the latter. In most cases, the decisions regarding post exposure treatment and patient management will need to be made in the jurisdiction where the bite occurs and medical treatment is sought.

Serological testing, as indicated in the rule, is one of 2 options for demonstrating that a dog or cat was previously vaccinated. The other is documentation. Once it has been established by either means that an animal has been previously vaccinated, the vaccination status of the animal will not change in response to subsequent exposures to confirmed or suspected rabid animals. In addition, all exposed dogs or cats (regardless of vaccination status) are required a booster vaccination at the first and each subsequent quarantine, providing additional vaccination. Therefore, it would not be appropriate to mandate serology for each subsequent exposure for evidence of prior vaccination.