Closed Jan 27, 2016 · Discussion · 14 Participants · 3 Topics · 24 Answers · 2 Replies · 13 Votes

14

3

24

2

13

**PARTICIPANTS** 

**TOPICS** 

**ANSWERS** 

**REPLIES** 

**VOTES** 

# **SUMMARY OF TOPICS**

#### 

· Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Dec 23, 2015 2:04 pm · 2 Votes

Suggest that this proposal also include the provisions listed under the Code of Ordinances Sect. 15-2-3(c3) regarding excessive noise of pets. Thanks.

· Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Dec 31, 2015 3:35 pm · 4 Votes

I like all that is proposed. Two comments: one hour may be short for people leaving to shop or do other errands. I think it very important to have no night tethering to enforce against barking at night. Thanks!

· Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Dec 31, 2015 4:18 pm 1 € 0 Votes

I feel that walking a pet on a leash is certainly permissible at any time of day (or night) but tethering ought to be limited between sunset and sunrise. What those limits are; I haven't the foggiest, but 10p to 6a is a good enough starting point.

#### Response:

· Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Jan 04, 2016 9:21 pm I would like to add that dogs should be on a leash and there needs to be an ordinance, if it's not. I thought it was until I noticed the dogs roaming unleashed in certain areas. Tethering should definitely be on a limited basis, but how could this be monitored?

While I think no animal should ever be tethered I would suggest a 30 minute maximum

Closed Jan 27, 2016 · Discussion · 14 Participants · 3 Topics · 24 Answers · 2 Replies · 13 Votes

duration no more than twice a day. If you don't want the animals to be part of your family, don't adopt or buy them. The tethering material should weigh no more than a tenth of the animals weight. Baby and elderly animals should never be left unattended. Besides food and water, all animals who have outdoor homes should have heating or fans to keep their homes comfortable all year long. Cats should never, ever be on a tether.

· Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Jan 01, 2016 9:12 am 13 1 Votes

That the City Council is looking into changing regulations regarding tethering of animals is admirable. And, I strongly agree with Paul that "excessive pet noise" should be included in the regs. This said, before the regulations are changed, let's get testimony from local professionals (vets) and even consult national sources on what the parameters of appropriate tethering should be. I personally think that 60 minutes would be too constrictive, as Sam has noted. Finally, let's define "a tether." As a teen, I had a tether for my dog that allowed her to roam, to include entering-exiting her dog house, hundreds of feet end-to-end, and 50-feet side-to-side while attached to an overhead, spring-supported tether. So, "tether" needs to be defined.

· Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Jan 02, 2016 2:33 pm 1 2 Votes

I think an acceptable air temperature range should also be specified. I have seen animals tethered out in absolutely frigid weather, with only minimal shelter, and with or without food/water. Educating folks about how to be truly sensitive and thoughtful toward their animals will help a lot to reduce the incidence of inappropriate tethering.

· Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Jan 03, 2016 2:57 am 13 3 Votes

RE: Dog teathering specifically - Dogs enjoy being outside and in addition to walks city dogs can gain pleasure from porch or front yard exercises, both free and tethered. Supervised dog freedom should be encouraged and is encouraged in this language but appropriate tethering could be defined in a way that benefits health and well being of the animal as well as public safety and should not rush to punish. The ordinance or the specific length of the tether is right to exclude long term use of a leash as a tether but should allow for temporary parking a dog with a standard leash or limit it to a brief but specified time.

· Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Jan 04, 2016 5:12 pm 1 1 Votes

No dogs should be allowed outside at night. In addition, no dogs should be chained up for longer than a hour. However, to make it more enforceable, no dog should be left outside for any period of time unless the homeowner/resident is at home.

· Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Jan 04, 2016 11:05 pm 1 → 0 Votes

Closed Jan 27, 2016 · Discussion · 14 Participants · 3 Topics · 24 Answers · 2 Replies · 13 Votes

To me, the monetary penalties proposed are outrageous and, like Sam said, overly burdensome for low-income folks. Our concern should be for the animals so that taking the animal to the pound, then removing it from the owner should suffice..

#### Response:

· Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Jan 05, 2016 1:06 pm I am contradicting myself from my comments on the penalties section of the ordinance, but we need to be careful that taking animals to the pound does not result in their death. We need to address issues with our local high-kill shelter before assuming the animal is better off there. A fifty-fifty chance of making it out alive isn't good enough.

· Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Jan 06, 2016 11:07 pm 1 → 0 Votes

No Animal should be tethered and left for more than 30' unless they are a grazing animal. That is for the welfare of the animal, the owner and the neighbors. Barking unleashed/attended dogs and stray cats are the hall mark of a 3rd world citizenry that has enormous sanitation and health problems; it shows a disregard for their and everyone's right to a healthy environment.

· Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Jan 07, 2016 11:54 am

I strongly agree that a tethering ordinance is necessary. My concern with the ordinance is that instead of seeing dogs tied up and standing on top of ramshackle dog houses for hours and days on end, we will see a tiny fenced enclosure and the ramshackle dog house and dog no better off than before. Just in a different form of confinement. Just drive past that dog that lives across from Simms.....his entire life has been spent in that tiny space. It's disgusting, but of course, purely within the law.

# WHAT SHOULD THE CORRECT PENALTY BE FOR A VIOLATION OF THE PROPOSED ORDINANCE? © 6 Answers · 0 Replies

Under the current proposal, the first violation constitutes a Class 3 misdemeanor, punishable by fine of up to \$500 with increasing fines and the possibility of jail time for subsequent offenses within the same year.

· Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Dec 31, 2015 3:45 pm · 3 Votes

Jail time is punitive and jail and high fines are extremely difficult on low income families, not fair. I propose 1) a warning, followed by 2) removal of the animal to the pound with all costs paid by the owner for a week, followed by 3) permanent removal of the animal with a fine to cover related costs.

Closed Jan 27, 2016 · Discussion · 14 Participants · 3 Topics · 24 Answers · 2 Replies · 13 Votes

 $\cdot$  Citizen  $\cdot$  (Postal Code: unknown)  $\cdot$  Dec 31, 2015 5:01 pm  $\cdot$  1 Votes

No matter your income, if you buy or adopt an animal you should do so with the understanding you will take care of the animal for its life. If someone leaves a dog outside in the freezing cold, tethered with a heavy chain, all night long, simply chain the owner outside in the freezing cold with just a light coat for protection. Make sure the chain is weight equivalent as to what the human put on the animal, and have them sit outside like that for as long as they forced the animal to. If animal cruelty punishment was an eye for an equivalent eye, animal abuse would be greatly reduced.

 $\cdot$  Citizen  $\cdot$  (Postal Code: unknown)  $\cdot$  Dec 31, 2015 10:26 pm  $\cdot$  0 Votes

Sam Nickels is right on target. The motivation presented for this ordinance is to educate pet owners and protect pets. The penalties as written set this ordinance up to be used to target and abuse people.

· Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Jan 03, 2016 3:03 am 1分 1 Votes

Fines can pay for enhanced animal welfare programs and finding new homes for animals if necessary. We should not confiscate animals without a plan for their welfare AKA a new local no-kill shelter or as close as city can get to a path for positive animal welfare. Annual Warning, \$50 Fine, \$100 Fine, \$500 fine.

Agree that this steep fine will overly punish low-income families. It will be hard to enforce. I suggest first time be warning with education and referral for assistance as needed by local rescue/spay/neuter groups, second be mandatory attendance to an education class, and third be removal of the animal with a one year prohibition on obtaining another animal.

· Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Jan 07, 2016 12:10 pm 1 → 0 Votes

It is the saddest thing in the world to read that an owner ended up having to surrender an animal b/c he/she could not pay boarding costs when an animal was confiscated and/or lost, and then found. Now the animal is an owner surrender and can be killed at will. Education and referral to agencies will help owners understand the difference between chattel and companion. I do not support fines as a means to compliance. Fines punish the animal, not the owner. The animal pays with its life more often than not.

# SHOULD THIS ORDINANCE APPLY ONLY TO DOGS OR OTHER ANIMALS INCLUDING POT BELLY PIGS, GOATS, CATS, ETC.?

Closed Jan 27, 2016 · Discussion · 14 Participants · 3 Topics · 24 Answers · 2 Replies · 13 Votes

· Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Dec 23, 2015 3:47 pm 1 1 Votes

I agree we should change the tethering ordinance for dogs to the above guidelines, but it would be wrong to stop there. Cats are chained in our county also. I've reported this to several agencies, to no avail. I've also contacted someone on our county board of supervisors. We have the momentum now, let's use it! The local media, both news and social media, carried this story a few months ago....this is a black eye on our county! It's clearly time for change. Thank you for considering these necessary changes.

Cats are the biggest killer by far of birds. But tethering seems extreme for cats. Can we limit the number of cats owned to two/household?

· Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Dec 31, 2015 4:56 pm 1 ℃ 0 Votes

No cat should ever be tethered. Dogs for a very short time if they need to go to the bathroom, then the human can clean up after them. Humans with outdoors cats should be required by law to have bells on the cats collar to protect birds. I don't know very much about pot bellied pigs. but I would think the rules for dogs should apply to them. Tethered no more than 2 times a day for a maximum of 30 minutes

· Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Jan 04, 2016 5:10 pm 1 0 Votes

There needs to be a time restriction for dogs and a time limit. A dog should not be tied up overnight, because it is only a nuisance for any neighbors. In the county, it's not as big a deal due to the potential for large parcels of land. Pigs and cats shouldn't even be considered or allowed to be chained up outside.

· Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Jan 07, 2016 12:00 pm 1 → 0 Votes

Pot bellied pigs could be tethered, in the same manner as a dog. Are they allowed in city limits? Pot bellied pigs are smart, and can be perfect companions. I don't believe cats should ever be tethered, for their own safety. For that matter, I am a firm believer that cats should not be allowed to roam at will. It is dangerous for them.