

From: [Randall Tranowski](#)
To: [Council Comment](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Public Comment- Bark Down Barriers Ordinance (2026-00871)-August 19 Hearing
Date: Monday, August 10, 2026 4:43:39 PM
Attachments: [Written Comment in Support of Bark Down Barriers \(2026-00871\).docx](#)

You don't often get email from rtranowski90@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Members of the Public Health, Safety & Equity Committee:

Please accept the attached written comment in support of Bark Down Barriers (2026-00871) for consideration in connection with the Public Health, Safety & Equity Committee's August 19, 2026 public hearing.

While I am not a Minneapolis resident, this issue directly intersects with people in my life who have felony histories, including a Minneapolis resident whose dog I regularly help walk. My comments also reflect my broader interest in reentry, rehabilitation, and the role that responsibility, companionship, and caring for another living being can play in rebuilding a meaningful life.

I strongly support the central purpose of Bark Down Barriers. My written comments also encourage the Committee to consider whether individualized, evidence-based pathways toward responsible animal ownership could eventually provide additional opportunities for rehabilitation while continuing to protect animal welfare.

Thank you for considering my comments and for including them with the public input regarding this ordinance.

Sincerely,

Randall J. Tranowski

--

"Change tomorrow, today."

[EXTERNAL] This email originated from outside of the City of Minneapolis. Please exercise caution when opening links or attachments.

Written Comment in Support of Bark Down Barriers (2026-00871)
Minneapolis Public Health, Safety & Equity Committee

Members of the Public Health, Safety & Equity Committee:

I am writing in support of the Bark Down Barriers ordinance (2026-00871) and its effort to remove barriers to pet ownership based solely on a person's prior felony conviction.

I do not live in Minneapolis, but this issue is personal to me. I regularly walk the dog of a friend who is a Minneapolis resident and has a prior felony conviction. I have seen firsthand how much he loves his dog and, equally important, how much his dog loves and depends upon him. Their relationship is one of companionship, responsibility, routine, and care. I also share my life with someone who has a felony conviction, and I hope that someday having a dog will be part of the life and home we continue building together.

These experiences have made me question what someone's felony status, by itself, actually tells us about their ability to responsibly care for an animal.

I am particularly concerned by the financial implications of the current ordinance. Requiring an additional \$273 permit because of a person's criminal history creates a financial barrier without necessarily demonstrating anything about responsible pet ownership. Someone's ability to afford an additional \$273 does not demonstrate their ability to provide food, veterinary care, exercise, shelter, affection, or a safe home for an animal.

This becomes especially important in the context of reentry. People returning from incarceration may already encounter substantial barriers to housing, employment, transportation, financial stability, and community acceptance. Successful reentry, meanwhile, asks people to establish precisely the qualities that responsible pet ownership can require: routine, consistency, accountability, patience, connection, and responsibility for something beyond oneself.

There is research that gives us reason to take that relationship seriously. Han et al. (2026) examined administrative data from the Washington State Department of Corrections, comparing 674 participants in prison-based dog-training programs with 666 statistically matched nonparticipants. Participation was associated with a small but statistically significant decrease in the risk of recidivism, and longer participation in the dog program was associated with further decreases in recidivism risk. Importantly, the researchers also cautioned that additional research is necessary to identify the mechanisms responsible for those outcomes.

Earlier research points in a similar direction. Villafaina-Domínguez et al. (2020) conducted a systematic review of 20 studies involving 1,577 incarcerated participants. Most interventions involved dog training, caring for dogs, or vocational and educational activities involving dogs. Thirteen of the studies reported statistically significant improvements, and the researchers concluded that dog-based interventions may improve anxiety, stress, recidivism, and other social variables among incarcerated populations.

Those findings do not prove that simply owning a dog prevents recidivism, nor should we claim that they do. They do, however, challenge us to think more carefully about the role that caring for another living being can play in rehabilitation.

Initially, that was where my support for removing restrictions stopped.

I believed there was an obvious distinction between someone convicted of an offense unrelated to animals and someone previously convicted of animal cruelty or mistreatment. Protecting animals must matter, and someone's history of harming an animal is plainly more relevant to future animal ownership than an unrelated felony conviction.

But the more I considered that position—and the available research—the more difficult another question became:

At what point do we allow someone to demonstrate that they have changed?

The research does give us reason to take previous animal abuse seriously. Reid and Alleyne's (2024) narrative review of animal-abuse recidivism found high rates of reoffending among individuals who had harmed animals and identified a history of animal abuse as a risk factor for future animal harm. At the same time, the authors concluded that more robust research is needed to better understand the distinct risk and protective factors associated with animal-abuse recidivism. Their review also identified risk-assessment tools intended specifically for this population.

To me, that evidence argues for thoughtful assessment—not necessarily permanent assumptions.

A prior act can be relevant without necessarily telling us everything about who someone will be years later. One incident is not necessarily a lifelong pattern. Neither should we assume every offense is equivalent in severity or circumstance. And when another responsible adult in a household has never harmed an animal, I question whether that person's opportunity to have a pet should automatically be determined by another household member's past.

Perhaps the answer is not simply restriction or no restriction.

For people with prior animal-related offenses, Minneapolis could explore an individualized pathway back to responsible pet ownership: a meaningful period without another animal-related offense; consideration of the severity and circumstances of the original offense; completion of relevant treatment, counseling, humane-education, or animal-care programming; demonstrated rehabilitation; and, where appropriate, individualized risk assessment by Animal Care and Control or another qualified professional.

Such a pathway could allow applicants to provide evidence of rehabilitation rather than relying solely on the passage of time. When applicable and voluntarily provided, this might include a recommendation from a probation or parole officer; documentation of relevant counseling, treatment, or educational programming; or letters of support from employers, coworkers, neighbors, friends, veterinarians, or others who can speak to the individual's demonstrated responsibility and conduct.

No single recommendation should automatically determine eligibility, nor should access to a particular professional become another barrier. Instead, these materials could contribute to an individualized review that asks a more meaningful question than simply how many years have passed:

What has this person done to demonstrate that they are prepared to safely care for another living being?

Where animal-welfare professionals determine it can be done safely, Minneapolis might also consider a progressive pathway involving supervised animal contact. Participation in an approved animal-care, humane-education, training, volunteer, or similar supervised program could provide an opportunity to demonstrate appropriate behavior around animals before unrestricted ownership is considered. This would

provide actual behavioral evidence of rehabilitation rather than relying exclusively upon the applicant's words, character references, or the passage of time.

For someone whose previous offense involved an animal, requiring evidence of rehabilitation acknowledges the seriousness of that history while also recognizing that rehabilitation must eventually mean something in practice. If our systems ask people to participate in treatment, follow supervision requirements, develop accountability, rebuild relationships, and demonstrate changed behavior, our policies should provide meaningful opportunities for that demonstrated change to be considered.

A reasonably priced special permit could further demonstrate investment and accountability without becoming another substantial financial barrier. The City could explore reducing the current \$273 amount—for example, to \$100—and whether revenue associated with such a program could support humane education, rehabilitation programming, or appropriately designed animal-assisted interventions for people who otherwise could not access them.

I do not pretend to know whether three years, five years, or another period is the evidence-based answer. I do believe it is reasonable to ask why ten years is appropriate, whether an automatic household restriction is necessary in every circumstance, and whether rehabilitation can be evaluated by something more meaningful than simply the passage of time.

There is an important contradiction worth considering.

Within correctional settings, programs have entrusted incarcerated individuals with dogs—asking participants to train them, care for them, and accept responsibility for another living being. A systematic review found potential improvements in areas including anxiety, stress, and social variables, while the recent Washington State study found an association between prison-based dog-program participation and reduced recidivism risk (Han et al., 2026; Villafaina-Domínguez et al., 2020).

If caring for another life can be part of developing responsibility, connection, and purpose while someone is incarcerated, I believe we should at least ask whether those relationships can help sustain those qualities after someone returns home.

Companionship should not be treated as trivial in reentry. Neither should being needed.

An animal needs someone to wake up in the morning. It needs to be fed. It needs exercise. It needs patience when it misbehaves, veterinary care when it is sick, and affection when it seeks connection. In return, an animal can provide companionship, routine, affection, and a relationship largely unconcerned with the worst thing its person has ever done.

None of this means animal safety should be sacrificed in the name of second chances. The evidence concerning animal-abuse recidivism means those concerns deserve to be taken seriously (Reid & Alleyne, 2024). Instead, I believe it means our policies should distinguish as carefully as possible between demonstrated risk and permanent assumptions about people because of their past.

Accountability and rehabilitation do not have to be opposites. Good policy can require someone to demonstrate change while also providing a meaningful opportunity to prove that change has occurred.

For those reasons, I support Bark Down Barriers and urge the Committee to advance Ordinance 2026-00871. I particularly support removing restrictions and financial penalties based solely upon felony status when the underlying conviction bears no relationship to animal welfare.

I also encourage the Council to continue the conversation beyond this ordinance: examine the evidence supporting the remaining waiting periods and household restrictions; consider individualized pathways for people with animal-related convictions to demonstrate rehabilitation; and ask whether our animal-control policies can protect animals without permanently closing the door on redemption.

People returning from incarceration have served the sentences imposed upon them. Successful reentry requires accountability, but it also requires opportunities to build meaningful lives afterward.

Sometimes, part of building that life may be as ordinary—and as meaningful—as having something waiting at the door when you come home.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Randall J. Tranowski

References

- Han, T. M., Flynn, E., Peña, R. E., & Morris, K. N. (2026). Measuring the impact of prison-based dog training programs on recidivism: A propensity score-matched survival analysis. *Journal of the Society for Social Work and Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1086/727360>
- Reid, O., & Alleyne, E. (2024). Animal abuse recidivism: A narrative review. *Journal of Forensic Practice*, 26(1), 18–30. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JFP-07-2023-0036>
- Villafaina-Domínguez, B., Collado-Mateo, D., Merellano-Navarro, E., & Villafaina, S. (2020). Effects of dog-based animal-assisted interventions in prison population: A systematic review. *Animals*, 10(11), 2129. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani10112129>

To: CouncilComment@minneapolismn.gov

Subject: Bark Down Barriers Comment

Dear Members of the Public Health, Safety and Equity Committee,

My name is James “Mike” McHaney. I’m a Ward 2 resident in Southeast Minneapolis, and I’m writing in support of the Bark Down Barriers ordinance. I’m asking you to vote yes.

I know this ordinance from the inside. I’m the person who first brought MCO 66.80 to Council Member Wonsley’s office. But I don’t want this to be about me — I want it to be about how the current law actually works on the ground.

Let me be clear up front: I’m not here to minimize my past or paint myself as a victim. I have a felony conviction. I own that, and I’ve done the work to build a different life. But a permit fee on my dog doesn’t answer for anything I did — it just punishes me for still being here and trying to live right.

Here’s what it did to me. In February I adopted a dog from the city’s own shelter, Minneapolis Animal Care and Control. His name is Houdini, a 73-pound American bulldog mix — neutered, microchipped, current on his rabies vaccine, every box checked. The city adopted him to me. And then the same city charged me a \$250 “prohibited animal” permit fee to keep him, on top of the \$30 regular pet license every owner pays. That’s \$280 to keep a shelter dog — because of a past felony conviction, not because of anything Houdini or I have done. My neighbor with the same size dog pays the \$30 and nothing more.

And it doesn’t stop. I have to pay that fee again every single year for the rest of his life. Houdini is three. If he lives another decade, that’s a running tax on a dog the city itself adopted out — with no end except his death.

Here’s what makes it worse. No one inspected my home. No one assessed Houdini’s behavior. No one checked whether I know the first thing about handling a large dog — which I do. While I was incarcerated, I was trained to raise and handle service animals for Leader Dog for the Blind and Can Do Canines. The state trusted me to raise dogs that guide the blind. The city won’t trust me with a bulldog from its own shelter without a \$250 annual fee. Nobody looked at any of that. They just charged me.

I kept every record. I paid the fee. I filed the permit. I did everything the ordinance asked, and I still believe it’s wrong. It doesn’t measure whether a dog is dangerous — 21 pounds triggers it, a service animal in training is exempt but a family pet is not. It measures whether the owner is poor and justice-impacted, and then charges them for it, year after year. That’s not public safety. It’s a fee for coming home and trying to live a normal life.

The records behind every one of these facts are attached: the city's own permit approval, the \$250 receipt, the \$30 regular license charge, and the adoption and vaccination paperwork.

Please pass Bark Down Barriers and take this off the books. Thank you for your time.

Respectfully,

James "Mike" McHaney

Ward 2, Southeast Minneapolis

Houdini



Houdini — adopted from Minneapolis Animal Care & Control, February 2026. Neutered, microchipped, current on rabies. The dog the city classifies as “prohibited.”

Exhibit A

City of Minneapolis - Restricted Ownership Permit Approval

RESTRICTED OWNERSHIP PERMIT APPROVAL LETTER

February 23, 2026

James McHaney
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Dear James McHaney:

Your Application for a Prohibited Ownership Permit has been reviewed and approved.

“Scott” a neutered male, 3-year-old, white and black, American Bulldog mix.

Conditions to maintain Permit:

- James McHaney may not possess or have care, custody or control over any canine other than the one described above.
- James McHaney maintains copy of current rabies certificate for canine with MACC
- Shall maintain compliance with all rules, regulations and statutes pertaining to the responsible care and ownership of animal

If you have any questions, please call 612 -673-6222.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

John Kilner

John Kilner
Field Operations and Investigations Manager

enc: Change of Address Notification; MCO 66.80 Restriction on future ownership.

MINNEAPOLIS ANIMAL CARE AND CONTROL, 212 17TH Avenue North, Minneapolis MN 55411
612-673-6222 or 311

Shelter Hours: Monday – Friday: 1:00pm – 6:00 pm, Saturday: 11:30am – 3:30 pm, Sunday: Closed

For reasonable accommodations or alternative formats, please call the Regulatory Services Accessibility Line at 612-673-3221, or email RegulatoryServicesADALine@minneapolismn.gov. People who are deaf or hard of hearing can use a relay service to call 311 at 612-673-3000. TTY users call 612-263-6850. Para asistencia, llame al 612-673-2700 - Rau kev pab 612-673-2800 - Hadii aad Caawimaad u baahantahay 612-673-3500.

Exhibit B

Receipt R26-001253 - \$250 Prohibited Ownership Permit fee

RECEIPT

Receipt Number: **R26-001253**

2026/02/04 16:04:17.95

RECEIVED FROM: P320737
JAMES MCHANNEY

Page 1 of 1

Item	Description	Animal Name	Reference No.	Price	Quantity	Amount
	PROHIBITED OWNERSHIP PROHIBITED OWNERSHIP PERMIT APPLICATI			\$250.00	1	\$250.00

Total Fees Due: \$250.00

Payments:	Cash:	\$0.00
	Check:	\$0.00
	Credit:	\$250.00

Total Payments Received: \$250.00

Thank You!

Change:	\$0.00
Balance Due:	\$0.00

For reasonable accomodations or alternative formates, pelase call the Regulatory Services Accessibiilty Line at 612-673-3221, or email RegulatoryServicesADALine@minneapolismn.gov. People who are deaf or hard of hearing can use a relay service to call 311 at 612-673-3000. TTY users call 612-263-6850. Para asistencia, llame at 612-673-2700 - Rau kev pab 612-673-2800 - Hadii add Caawimaad u baahantahay 612-673-3500.

Exhibit C

Regular pet license - \$30 charge to Animal Care & Control, 2/14/26

Detail Continued

◆ - Pay Over Time and/or Cash Advance activity

Amount

02/14/26	ANIMAL CARE AND CONTROL ANIMAL CARE AN	MINNEAPOLIS	MN	\$30.00 ◆
----------	--	-------------	----	-----------

Exhibit D

MACC Adoption Contract & Certificate of Vaccination

Animal Identification Information

Animal ID : A388346	Primary Breed: Amer Bulldog	Activity #:
Type: Dog	Color: White	Impound #: K26-006313
Name: *scott	Gender: Neutered Male	Adoption Date:
Estimated Current Age: 3Y	Weight: 73.40	Chip #: 941010002617061

This agreement and contract signed on has been freely entered into by James Mchaney (buyer), hereinafter referred to as "Adopter" and Minneapolis Animal Care & Control (hereinafter referred to as MACC).

MACC states that the animal described above and identified by MACC Animal ID # A388346 was legally impounded, and may now be legally adopted by MACC.

James Mchaney swears to be 18 years or older and agrees to be bound by and to comply with the following terms and conditions:

TERMS AND CONDITIONS

1. MACC states that the Adopter may return this animal within a period of fourteen (14) calendar days from the date of Adoption and receive a refund. (Processing time for refunds is six (6) to eight (8) weeks.) If the animal is returned, the adopter shall wait seven (7) business days before adopting from MACC again unless the animal is deemed medically unfit by a licensed veterinarian.
2. The Adopter acknowledges that MACC makes no guarantee to the health, condition or medical history of the animal. The Adopter agrees that the animal is adopted "as is" and that MACC shall NOT be responsible for any costs or claims in excess of the purchase price. MACC recommends that the Adopter has the animal checked by a licensed veterinarian within two (2) weeks of the adoption.
3. If the animal requires a rabies vaccination (MCO 65.10) and has **not** been vaccinated at the time of adoption, the Adopter agrees to have the animal rabies vaccinated by a licensed veterinarian. Proof of vaccination must be provided by the date stated on the Unvaccinated Animal License Hold Agreement.
4. Adopters who are residents of the City of Minneapolis are required to purchase a city pet license for any cat, dog or ferret at the time of adoption. (MCO 63.20)
5. Adopters who reside outside of the City of Minneapolis agree to comply with all pet licensing and other legal and regulatory requirements of their jurisdiction.
6. The Adopter agrees to provide proper and adequate food, water, shelter, veterinary care and kind treatment for the animal at all times, and to comply with all ordinances and statutes that may govern the care and or keeping of animals.
7. The Adopter understands that animals can be unpredictable and that MACC cannot anticipate or insure against any unexpected conduct of animals adopted from MACC. The Adopter acknowledges that MACC has not made through its agents, volunteers, or employees, any warranties regarding the future condition, temperament, or conduct of the animal. The Adopter hereby accepts the animal "as is," assume all risks and responsibilities associated with ownership of the animal, including bites, and hereby fully and completely release, indemnify, and hold harmless the City of Minneapolis, MACC, its directors, officers, volunteers, agents, servants, and employees from any claim, cause of action or liability of any sort or nature, whether known or unknown, directly arising out of or in connection with the adoption, care, or ownership, maintenance, retention, temperament, conduct, or condition of the animal.
8. The Adopter agrees that if he/she fails to abide by the above terms and conditions, the Adopter will forfeit all fees and ownership of this animal to MACC. Further, the Adopter understands that MACC has the right to seize the animal and disposition accordingly.

I hereby certify that I have thoroughly read this document and agree to all stipulations and requirements within this binding contract and certify that the information provided by me on the adoption application is true. I further acknowledge that providing false information on the adoption application or on this contract will void this contract and result in criminal or civil action against me and or forfeiture of the adopted pet. By signing below the Adopter acknowledges receipt from MACC of the animal described above and certifies that they have read this contract and agree to be legally bound by its provisions.

Jam

02/14/26

John Mehlhaff

MACC Staff 164

P320737

CERTIFICATE OF VACCINATION

Animal ID # A388346

Date of Rabies Vaccination: 2/4/2026

Next Rabies Vaccination Due By: 02/04/2027

OWNER OF ANIMAL

Name: JAMES MICHAEL MCHANAY

Address: [REDACTED]

City/State/Zip: [REDACTED]

Phone #: [REDACTED]

This is to certify...

THAT I HAVE VACCINATED AGAINST RABIES THE ANIMAL DESCRIBED BELOW:

Patient Information:

ID #: A388346

PATIENT: *SCOTT

SPECIES: Canine

BREED: AMER BULLDOG MIX

COLOR/MARKINGS: WHITE / BLACK

WEIGHT: 73.40

AGE: 3y

SEX: Neutered Male

MICROCHIP #: 941010002617061

DR. ASHLEY THOMPSON LIC#13620

VETERINARIAN / VETERINARY LICENSE #

Ashley A. Thompson, DVM

Signature of Veterinarian

Rabies Vaccine Information:

MFG/PRODUCT: VANGUARD

SERIAL NO: 809512

LOT EXP: 05 SEP 26

An animal is not considered completely immunized for at least 28 days after the initial or primary vaccination is administered.



www.SmallSums.org

August 13, 2026
Minneapolis City Council and Mayor Frey
Minneapolis, MN

Dear City Council members and Mayor Frey,

We are writing in support of the proposed changes to the Minneapolis City Ordinance related to Animal Care and Control: Dangerous and Potentially Dangerous Animals. Specifically, we support removal of the section of Title 4, Chapter 66 that currently serves as a significant barrier to certain formerly incarcerated community members from owning certain pets. We believe this discriminatory language is not only unnecessary, but also actively harmful to our neighbors who are re-entering our shared community and building healthy lives back at home. For many people, pets are part of their family, and everyone deserves to make their case.

Small Sums is a 501(c)3 non-profit organization that's been serving Minnesota since 2006. We are dedicated to ending homelessness and housing instability for workers who are ready to re-enter the workforce. We supply new work gear (clothes, shoes or boots, bus cards, tools) to individuals experiencing housing instability, so that they can afford to start and keep new jobs. Workers who can establish steady employment can afford stable housing, and can then build a successful future.

Many of the workers we support are re-entering the workforce after incarceration, struggle to find employment because of the impact of justice systems on their records, are recovering from substance use disorders, or are escaping interpersonal or systemic violence or persistent poverty. Pet ownership is often a source of joy, comfort, and mental wellbeing for our neighbors navigating instability in their lives.

As we welcome people from all walks of life here in Minnesota, we owe individuals the opportunity to be free of discriminatory ordinances that prevent pet ownership.

We believe many of the challenges that justice-impacted individuals face, from housing insecurity to employment opportunities, stem from systemic discrimination, and discrimination is wrong.

With gratitude,

Seth Snyder, Executive Director - Small Sums

Come Visit Us At:

2375 University Ave W,
Suite 150
St Paul, MN 55114

By Mail:

PO Box 40561
St. Paul, MN 55104

Contact Us:

(651) 242-9441
Contactus@SmallSums.org

From: [Grant Johnson via Smartsheet](#)
To: [Council Comment](#)
Subject: Public Comment: Daniel Rockcastle
Date: Wednesday, August 19, 2026 12:58:28 PM



Public Comment: Daniel Rockcastle

Date: 08/19/26, 12:56 PM

2026-00871

Hi, my name is Daniel.

I want to focus on one specific change in this ordinance, because I think the difference between the current law and the proposed law is important.

Right now, Minneapolis has a preventive rule for people who have been convicted of certain violent felonies. For up to ten years after completing their sentence, if they want to keep an animal over 20 pounds, or another animal Animal Care and Control determines could pose a danger if misused, they have to get a special permit.

That is not a ban. It is a permit and review process.

This ordinance would eliminate that entire preventive requirement.

The argument for doing that is understandable. The permit creates an additional burden based on a past conviction, including a \$250 fee. MACC has also said these applications are rarely denied, and has cited that as a reason the process is more burdensome than useful.

But a low denial rate, by itself, does not tell us whether a preventive requirement is serving a useful purpose. There are several possible reasons permits might rarely be denied, and that fact alone does not show that the safeguard is ineffective.

The ordinance adds two new conviction-based reasons someone can be restricted from owning animals: animal mistreatment and second-degree manslaughter involving an animal. But those do something fundamentally

different.

Animal mistreatment applies after someone has already mistreated an animal. The manslaughter provision applies after someone fails to control a dangerous animal and, as a result, someone is killed.

The city also retains other rules dealing with dangerous animals and animal-related harm. But the specific thing being removed here is the preventive review based on a recent history of serious violence before the animal itself has become part of the problem.

So I think the real question is about which risk we are more willing to accept.

Under the current law, some people who would never misuse an animal will still have to get a permit.

If we repeal it, some people with a recent history of serious violence who genuinely do pose a risk will be able to keep a large or potentially dangerous animal without that review, and the city may not have an animal-related reason to intervene until something has already gone wrong.

I do not think those two mistakes are equal. A temporary permit requirement is a relatively modest burden. The potential consequence of failing to intervene in a genuinely dangerous situation can be much more serious.

If the current law is too broad, narrow it. If 20 pounds is the wrong cutoff, change it. If the fee is too high, lower it. If the permit process itself needs improvement, fix it.

But those are arguments for reforming the preventive safeguard, not eliminating it.

I am asking you to amend this ordinance and preserve a preventive permit requirement rather than removing it entirely.

Thank you.

Ward: Ward 11

Public Health, Safety & Equity (PHSE)