

ANIMAL CONTROL BOARD
SEMINOLE COUNTY, FLORIDA

PUBLIC HEARING TO DETERMINE THE DISPOSITION
OF TWO DANGEROUS DOGS
OWNED BY JOSEPH GAURINO
FILE NUMBER FL SC DD 1700091
&
FILE NUMBER FL SC DD 1700093

AND

REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

Thursday, September 15, 2011, 7:00 PM

Sheriff's Office/Public Safety Building
Community Room (Room #1-152)
150 Bush Boulevard
(Seminole County Operations Center)
Sanford, Florida 32773

- I. Call to Order.
 - A. Roll Call and Determination of Quorum.
 - B. Introduction of Board Members and Review of Hearing Process.
- II. Invocation of the Rule.
 - A. Opening statement of County.
 - B. Opening statement of Dog Owner.
- III. Presentation of County's Case.
 - A. County's direct examination of each of its witnesses.
 - B. Dog Owner's cross examination of each of the County witnesses.
 - C. Board's examination of each of the County witnesses.
- IV. Presentation of Dog Owner's Case.
 - A. Dog Owner's direct examination of each of its witnesses.
 - B. County's cross examination of each of the Dog Owner's witnesses.
 - C. Board's examination of each of the Dog Owner's witnesses.

- V. Closing Statement by the County.
- VI. Closing Statement by the Dog Owner.
- VII. Close of the evidentiary portion of the hearing.
 - A. Deliberation by the Board.
 - B. Announcement of the Board's decision.
 - C. Direction to staff for preparation and issuance of the Board Order.
- VIII. Minutes: April 14, 2011 and June 9, 2011.
- IX. Public Commentary.
 - Limited to 3 Minutes Per Speaker
 - Speaker Request Form Required
- X. Old Business.
- XI. New Business.
 - A. Phyllis Ayooob Presentation Relative to No Kill Nation Conference.
 - B. Future Agenda Items.
- XII. Reports.
 - A. Transport Statistics.
 - B. Kennel Statistics (Intakes & Outcomes).
 - C. Customer Contact Statistics.
 - D. Pet Data, Inc. Statistics.
- XIII. Confirmation of Next Meeting.
 - December 8, 2011
 - March 8, 2012
 - June 7, 2012
- XIV. Adjournment

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING THIS NOTICE, PLEASE CONTACT MORGAN WOODWARD, ANIMAL SERVICES MANAGER, AT 407-665-5202. PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES NEEDING ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN ANY OF THESE PROCEEDINGS SHOULD CONTACT THE HUMAN RESOURCES

DEPARTMENT ADA COORDINATOR 48 HOURS IN ADVANCE OF THE MEETING,
AT 407-665-7941.

PERSONS ARE ADVISED THAT, IF THEY DECIDE TO APPEAL ANY DECISION MADE AT THESE MEETINGS/HEARINGS, THEY WILL NEED A RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS AND FOR SUCH PURPOSES, THEY MAY NEED TO INSURE THAT A VERBATIM RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS IS MADE, WHICH INCLUDES THE TESTIMONY AND EVIDENCE UPON WHICH THE APPEAL IS TO BE BASED, PER SECTION 286.0105, FLORIDA STATUTES.

PLEASE NOTE THAT WHILE MEETINGS OF THE ANIMAL CONTROL BOARD ARE SUBJECT TO THE SUNSHINE LAW AND ALL ARE WELCOME TO ATTEND, NEITHER THE FACILITY NOR, IN MANY CASES, THE MATTERS DISCUSSED BY THE BOARD ARE SUITABLE FOR YOUNG CHILDREN. WE WOULD REQUEST THAT, UNLESS YOUR CHILDREN ARE TESTIFYING BEFORE THE BOARD, THEY REMAIN EITHER AT HOME OR OUTSIDE THE HEARING ROOM, WITH APPROPRIATE ADULT SUPERVISION.

SEMINOLE COUNTY ANIMAL SERVICES CUSTOMER CONTACTS					
FY09/10					
	FRONT DESK			DISPATCH	GRAND TOTAL
	LOBBY	PHONE	SUB TOTAL		
OCT	1,545	1,460	3,005	2,548	5,553
NOV	1,564	1,505	3,069	2,679	5,748
DEC	1,361	1,257	2,618	1,754	4,372
JAN	1,388	1,129	2,517	2,286	4,803
FEB	1,418	1,223	2,641	2,251	4,892
MAR	1,946	1,629	3,575	3,034	6,609
APR	1,416	1,260	2,676	2,296	4,972
MAY	1,351	1,283	2,634	2,663	5,297
JUN	1,764	1,706	3,470	2,801	6,271
SUB	13,753	12,452	26,205	22,312	48,517
JUL	1,467	1,473	2,940	1,921	4,861
AUG	1,599	1,635	3,234	2,188	5,422
SEP	1,883	1,861	3,744	2,350	6,094
TOTAL	18,702	17,421	36,123	28,771	64,894
SEMINOLE COUNTY ANIMAL SERVICES CUSTOMER CONTACTS					
FY10/11					
	FRONT DESK			DISPATCH	GRAND TOTAL
	LOBBY	PHONE	SUB TOTAL		
OCT	1,537	1,547	3,084	2,326	5,410
NOV	1,668	1,694	3,362	2,418	5,780
DEC	1,202	1,281	2,483	1,726	4,209
JAN	1,794	1,594	3,388	2,129	5,517
FEB	1,529	1,599	3,128	1,907	5,035
MAR	1,706	1,783	3,489	2,634	6,123
APR	1,341	1,210	2,551	2,340	4,891
MAY	1,776	1,553	3,329	2,302	5,631
JUN	1,940	1,606	3,546	2,543	6,089
JUL					
AUG					
SEP					
TOTAL	14,493	13,867	28,360	20,325	48,685

FISCAL YEAR 10 - 11 CUMULATIVE

Collections

PetData

Oct	\$	11,845.00
Nov	\$	10,903.90
Dec	\$	10,035.50
Jan	\$	12,569.50
Feb	\$	11,381.50
Mar	\$	12,778.50
Apr	\$	14,664.50
May	\$	14,898.50
Jun	\$	12,249.50
Jul	\$	-
Aug	\$	-
Sept	\$	-
Total	\$	111,326.40

Animal Services

Oct	\$	4,501.00
Nov	\$	3,299.00
Dec	\$	3,711.00
Jan	\$	4,352.00
Feb	\$	3,906.00
Mar	\$	5,289.00
Apr	\$	5,795.00
May	\$	5,495.00
Jun	\$	4,221.00
Jul	\$	-
Aug	\$	-
Sept	\$	-
Total	\$	40,569.00

Total Collections

\$ 151,895.40

Disbursements

PetData

Oct	\$	8,402.30
Nov	\$	7,296.70
Dec	\$	6,928.40
Jan	\$	8,849.65
Feb	\$	7,930.20
Mar	\$	9,055.90
Apr	\$	10,824.60
May	\$	10,726.05
Jun	\$	8,777.65
Jul	\$	-
Aug	\$	-
Sept	\$	-
Total	\$	78,791.45

Animal Services

Oct	\$	7,943.70
Nov	\$	6,906.20
Dec	\$	6,818.10
Jan	\$	8,071.85
Feb	\$	7,357.30
Mar	\$	9,011.60
Apr	\$	9,634.90
May	\$	9,667.45
Jun	\$	7,692.85
Jul	\$	-
Aug	\$	-
Sept	\$	-
Total	\$	73,103.95

Total

Disbursements

\$ 151,895.40

Fees owed to PetData

of new licenses

Oct	2,302
Nov	1,998
Dec	1,896
Jan	2,421
Feb	2,168
Mar	2,466
Apr	2,964

of replacement licenses

Oct	0
Nov	2
Dec	1
Jan	1
Feb	0
Mar	0
Apr	0

May	2,937
Jun	2,401
Jul	0
Aug	0
Sept	0
Total	21,553
Fee per new license	\$ 3.65
Total	\$ 78,668.45

May	0
Jun	1
Jul	0
Aug	0
Sept	0
Total	5
Fee per license	\$ 2.00
Total	\$ 10.00

Returned check(s), etc.

Oct	\$ -
Nov	\$ -
Dec	\$ 6.00
Jan	\$ 11.00
Feb	\$ 17.00
Mar	\$ 55.00
Apr	\$ 6.00
May	\$ 6.00
Jun	\$ 12.00
Jul	\$ -
Aug	\$ -
Sept	\$ -
Total	\$ 113.00

New license fees	\$ 78,668.45
Replacement license fees	\$ 10.00
Returned check(s), etc.	\$ 113.00
Total owed to PetData	\$ 78,791.45

Fees owed to Animal Services

Fees collected by Animal Services

Oct	\$ 4,501.00
Nov	\$ 3,299.00
Dec	\$ 3,711.00
Jan	\$ 4,352.00
Feb	\$ 3,906.00
Mar	\$ 5,289.00
Apr	\$ 5,795.00
May	\$ 5,495.00
Jun	\$ 4,221.00
Jul	\$ -

Fees remitted by PetData

Oct	\$ 3,442.70
Nov	\$ 3,607.20
Dec	\$ 3,107.10
Jan	\$ 3,719.85
Feb	\$ 3,451.30
Mar	\$ 3,722.60
Apr	\$ 3,839.90
May	\$ 4,172.45
Jun	\$ 3,471.85
Jul	\$ -

FISCAL YEAR 09-10 CUMULATIVE

Aug \$ -
 Sept \$ -
 Total \$ 40,569.00

Aug \$ -
 Sept \$ -
 Total \$ 32,534.95

Total collected by Animal Services \$ 40,569.00
 Total remitted by
 PetData \$ 32,534.95
 Total fees owed to Animal Services \$ 73,103.95

**Animal Services
 Disbursement**

General fund

Trust fund

Oct \$ 7,134.70
 Nov \$ 6,177.30
 Dec \$ 6,344.60
 Jan \$ 7,266.35
 Feb \$ 6,723.80
 Mar \$ 8,006.10
 Apr \$ 8,950.40
 May \$ 8,901.95
 Jun \$ 6,915.35
 Jul \$ -
 Aug \$ -
 Sept \$ -
 Total \$ 66,420.55

Oct \$ 809.00
 Nov \$ 728.90
 Dec \$ 473.50
 Jan \$ 805.50
 Feb \$ 633.50
 Mar \$ 1,005.50
 Apr \$ 684.50
 May \$ 765.50
 Jun \$ 777.50
 Jul \$ -
 Aug \$ -
 Sept \$ -
 Total \$ 6,683.40

Total general fund disbursement \$ 66,420.55
 Total trust fund disbursement \$ 6,683.40
 Total Animal Services disbursement \$ 73,103.95

Collections

PetData

Oct	\$	12,503.00
Nov	\$	13,220.00
Dec	\$	11,722.00
Jan	\$	12,308.00
Feb	\$	13,610.00
Mar	\$	15,081.50
Apr	\$	13,234.00
May	\$	13,096.00
Jun	\$	14,000.50
SUB	\$	118,775.00
Jul	\$	13,789.50
Aug	\$	15,066.00
Sept	\$	11,005.50
Total	\$	158,636.00

Disbursements

PetData

Oct	\$	8,533.90
Nov	\$	8,816.75
Dec	\$	7,900.95
Jan	\$	8,397.00
Feb	\$	8,908.65
Mar	\$	10,416.55
Apr	\$	9,397.10
May	\$	9,350.00
Jun	\$	9,501.65
SUB	\$	81,222.55
Jul	\$	9,592.20
Aug	\$	10,299.30
Sept	\$	7,881.95
Total	\$	108,996.00

Animal Services

Oct	\$	3,206.00
Nov	\$	3,383.00
Dec	\$	3,256.00
Jan	\$	3,709.00
Feb	\$	3,544.00
Mar	\$	4,597.00
Apr	\$	4,652.00
May	\$	4,502.00
Jun	\$	4,446.00
SUB	\$	35,295.00
Jul	\$	4,136.00
Aug	\$	4,333.00
Sept	\$	3,606.00
Total	\$	47,370.00

Animal Services

Oct	\$	7,175.10
Nov	\$	7,786.25
Dec	\$	7,077.05
Jan	\$	7,620.00
Feb	\$	8,245.35
Mar	\$	9,261.95
Apr	\$	8,488.90
May	\$	8,248.00
Jun	\$	8,944.85
SUB	\$	72,847.45
Jul	\$	8,333.30
Aug	\$	9,099.70
Sept	\$	6,729.55
Total	\$	97,010.00

Total Collections \$ 206,006.00

Oct-Jun Collections \$ 154,070.00

Total

Disbursements \$ 206,006.00

Oct-Jun Disbursements \$ 154,070.00

Fees owed to PetData

of new licenses

Oct	2,326
Nov	2,415
Dec	2,163
Jan	2,300
Feb	2,421
Mar	2,847

of replacement licenses

Oct	1
Nov	1
Dec	0
Jan	1
Feb	2
Mar	0

Apr	2,574
May	2,560
Jun	2,601
SUB	22,207
Jul	2,628
Aug	2,782
Sept	2,123
Total	29,740

Apr	1
May	0
Jun	1
SUB	7
Jul	0
Aug	2
Sept	1
Total	10

Fee per new license	\$ 3.65
Total	\$ 108,551.00

Fee per license	\$ 2.00
Total	\$ 20.00

Returned check(s), etc.

Oct	\$ 42.00
Nov	\$ -
Dec	\$ 6.00
Jan	\$ -
Feb	\$ 68.00
Mar	\$ 25.00
Apr	\$ -
May	\$ 6.00
Jun	\$ 6.00
Jul	\$ -
Aug	\$ 141.00
Sept	\$ 131.00
Total	\$ 425.00

New license fees	\$ 108,551.00
Replacement license fees	\$ 20.00
Returned check(s), etc.	\$ 425.00
Total owed to PetData	\$ 108,996.00

Oct-Jun New Fees	\$ 81,055.55
Oct-Jun Rep. Fees	\$ 14.00
Returned Checks	\$ 153.00
Total Owed Pet Data	\$ 81,222.55

Fees owed to Animal Services

Fees collected by Animal Services

Oct	\$ 3,206.00
Nov	\$ 3,383.00
Dec	\$ 3,256.00
Jan	\$ 3,709.00
Feb	\$ 3,544.00
Mar	\$ 4,597.00
Apr	\$ 4,652.00

Fees remitted by PetData

Oct	\$ 3,969.10
Nov	\$ 4,403.25
Dec	\$ 3,821.05
Jan	\$ 3,911.00
Feb	\$ 4,701.35
Mar	\$ 4,664.95
Apr	\$ 3,836.90

May	\$	4,502.00
Jun	\$	4,446.00
SUB	\$	35,295.00
Jul	\$	4,136.00
Aug	\$	4,333.00
Sept	\$	3,606.00
Total	\$	47,370.00

May	\$	3,746.00
Jun	\$	4,498.85
SUB	\$	37,552.45
Jul	\$	4,197.30
Aug	\$	4,766.70
Sept	\$	3,123.55
Total	\$	49,640.00

Total collected by Animal Services	\$	47,370.00
Total remitted by PetData	\$	49,640.00
Total fees owed to Animal Services	\$	97,010.00

**Animal Services
Disbursement**

General fund

Oct	\$	6,588.10
Nov	\$	7,170.25
Dec	\$	6,631.05
Jan	\$	6,811.00
Feb	\$	7,540.35
Mar	\$	8,364.45
Apr	\$	7,764.90
May	\$	7,755.00
Jun	\$	8,379.35
SUB	\$	67,004.45
Jul	\$	7,492.80
Aug	\$	8,090.70
Sept	\$	6,123.05
Total	\$	88,711.00

Trust fund

Oct	\$	587.00
Nov	\$	616.00
Dec	\$	446.00
Jan	\$	809.00
Feb	\$	705.00
Mar	\$	897.50
Apr	\$	724.00
May	\$	493.00
Jun	\$	565.50
SUB	\$	5,843.00
Jul	\$	840.50
Aug	\$	1,009.00
Sept	\$	606.50
Total	\$	8,299.00

Total general fund disbursement	\$	88,711.00
Total trust fund disbursement	\$	8,299.00
Total Animal Services disbursement	\$	97,010.00

Oct-Jun Gen Fund	\$	67,004.45
Oct-Jun Trust Fund	\$	5,843.00
Total Disbursement	\$	72,847.45

Kennel Statistics Report
Intakes from 10/01/10 to 07/31/11

		CAT	DOG	FERRET	KITTEN	OTHER	PUPPY	TOTAL
BORN IN SHELTER	BORN IN SHELTER	58	0	0	24	0	10	92
	TOTAL	58	0	0	24	0	10	92
DISPOSAL REQUIRED	FIELD	284	68	0	1	885	1	1249
	FIELD OWNED	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	NIGHT	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	OVER THE COUNTER	21	29	2	1	7	0	60
	TOTAL	306	98	2	2	902	1	1311
EUTHANASIA REQUIRED	FIELD	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
	OVER THE COUNTER	72	155	1	0	5	0	234
	TOTAL	74	157	1	0	5	0	237
FOSTER	FIELD	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	OVER THE COUNTER	0	0	0	5	0	0	5
	TOTAL	0	1	0	5	0	0	5
OWNER SURRENDER		1	1	0	0	0	1	3
	FIELD	178	96	0	18	2	24	319
	OVER THE COUNTER	330	141	11	93	103	21	709
	TOTAL	507	241	11	111	105	26	1031
PROTECTIVE CUSTODY	CRUELTY	0	8	0	0	1	1	10
	EVICITION	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
	HOSPITAL	0	6	0	0	0	0	6
	OWNER DETAINED	0	10	0	0	2	0	13
	POLICE	9	24	0	0	7	6	46
	TOTAL	10	50	0	0	10	7	67
QUARANTINE	ANIMAL CONTROL	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	FIELD	48	96	0	4	25	1	174
	OVER THE COUNTER	16	31	0	1	2	0	50
	SPCA	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
	TOTAL	66	128	0	5	28	1	228
RETURN	FIELD	0	8	0	0	0	1	9
	OVER THE COUNTER	20	110	0	6	0	13	149
	TOTAL	20	118	0	6	0	14	158
STRAY		4	0	0	0	0	0	4

FY09/10 STATISTICS ON ADOPTED ANIMALS TRANSPORTED TO SEMINOLE COUNTY VETERINARIANS FOR SPAY/NEUTER					
		DOGS	DOGS	CATS	CATS
	# TRANSPORTED	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE
OCT	67	25	23	11	8
NOV	90	35	29	11	15
DEC	126	35	31	27	33
JAN	87	25	23	17	22
FEB	83	26	30	14	13
MAR	79	29	24	9	17
APR	84	33	32	15	4
MAY	79	32	29	8	10
JUN	92	21	22	26	23
JUL	108	36	43	20	9
SUB	895	297	286	158	154
AUG	104	31	35	17	21
SEP	88	40	22	9	17
TOTAL	1,087	368	343	184	192
FY10/11 STATISTICS ON ADOPTED ANIMALS TRANSPORTED TO SEMINOLE COUNTY VETERINARIANS FOR SPAY/NEUTER					
		DOGS	DOGS	CATS	CATS
	# TRANSPORTED	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE
OCT	87	36	28	11	12
NOV	73	27	22	13	11
DEC	108	30	26	31	21
JAN	109	35	34	15	25
FEB	144	28	42	30	44
MAR	107	33	33	21	20
APR	78	37	18	10	13
MAY	94	27	32	18	17
JUN	103	25	36	25	17
JUL	102	32	29	20	21
AUG					
SEP					
TOTAL	1005	310	300	194	201

2010/1

	Intake		Adoption		Reclaimed		Euth	
	Dog	Cat	Dog	Cat	Dog	Cat	Dog	Cat
1								
Oct	285	529	96	32	107	29	51	467
Nov	273	382	65	28	76	15	78	271
Dec	301	342	88	63	82	10	80	245
Jan	267	318	78	49	89	14	53	237
Feb	232	336	86	48	72	9	42	237
Mar	246	448	81	51	76	10	54	276
Apr	308	523	92	48	82	12	81	326
May	333	664	86	45	108	13	82	487
Jun	272	564	75	49	87	14	74	439
Jul	306	597	90	55	76	15	106	487
Aug								
Sept								
Total	2823	4703	837	468	855	141	701	3472

**SEMINOLE COUNTY
ANIMAL CONTROL BOARD
DANGEROUS DOG PUBLIC HEARING
“UNOFFICIAL”
April 14, 2011
7:00 PM**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Gail Nagan
Marylin Wittmer, Chairman
Debra Garrambone
Kathleen Prince
Gayle Hair, Vice Chairman
Dr. Joe Vaughan

MEMBERS ABSENT: Keith Weissman

OTHERS: Morgan Woodward, Animal Services Manager
Ann Colby, Assistant County Attorney
Elaine RiCharde, Clerk to the Board

The following is a non-verbatim transcript of the Seminole County Animal Control Board public hearing held April 14, 2011, at 7:00 PM, at the Sheriff's Office/Public Safety Building, 150 Bush Boulevard, Sanford, Florida, for the purpose of hearing an appeal of the determination to declare as dangerous a dog named "Shamu" owned by Joseph Guarino.

I. Call to Order.

A. Roll Call and Determination of Quorum.

Roll Call was taken by the Clerk. A quorum was present.

B. Introduction of Board Members and Review of Hearing Process.

Ms. Wittmer asked Board members to introduce themselves.

II. Invocation of the Rule.

Ms. Wittmer introduced Ann Colby, Assistant County Attorney, who explained the meaning of invoking the rule.¹

Ms. Wittmer asked if either side wanted to invoke the rule. Joseph Guarino, the dog owner, responded affirmatively.

Witnesses Gael Self, Richard Self, Scott Hyatt, Steve Oggeri and Carole Coleman stated their names and were sworn. Ms. Colby directed the witnesses to wait outside the hearing room until called to give their testimony.

A. Opening statement of County.

Morgan Woodward, Animal Services Manager, introduced himself. He gave an overview of the investigation report and supporting documents. He reviewed the statutory foundation to declare “Shamu” a dangerous dog.

B. Opening Statement of Dog Owner.

Mr. Guarino gave his opening statement to include owning another dog that is a dangerous dog, that he can disprove the alleged incidents in the investigation report, and that a law suit has been filed against him by his neighbors.

III. Presentation of County’s Case.

A. County’s direct examination of each of its witnesses.

¹ Invoking the rule requires witnesses to wait outside the hearing room except when giving testimony and to refrain from speaking with each other or discussing the case except when giving their testimony.

- B. Dog Owner's cross examination of each of the County witnesses.
- C. Board's examination of each of the County witnesses.

Morgan Woodward stated his name and was sworn.

Mr. Woodward began to present his case. He reviewed the investigation documents to include complaint/activity calls at Mr. Guarino's address and citations and written warnings issued to Mr. Guarino relative to violations of the Seminole County Code, Chapter 20.

Mr. Woodward next reviewed the following incidents upon which he made the dangerous dog declaration.

Mr. Woodward reviewed documents and sworn statements relative to a bite incident on November 29, 2009, involving multiple dogs owned by Mr. Guarino.

The bite victim, Lauren Hyatt, was not present to give testimony. Her husband, Scott Hyatt, was in attendance.

Scott Hyatt was called and released as a witness without giving any testimony.

Mr. Woodward called Steve Oggeri to give testimony about an incident on May 2, 2010, when "Shamu" was running at large and charged Mr. Oggeri who was on his property at the time. Mr. Woodward, Mr. Guarino and the Board questioned Mr. Oggeri.

Steve Oggeri was released as a witness.

Mr. Woodward called Carole Coleman, Animal Services Field Supervisor, to give testimony about an incident on June 24, 2010, when “Shamu” was running at large and attacked a dog owned by Carole Piscopo. Mr. Woodward and the Board questioned Ms. Coleman.

Ms. Coleman was retained as a witness.

Mr. Woodward called Richard Self to give testimony about an incident on September 19, 2010, when “Shamu” was running at large and attacked Mr. Self who was on his property at the time. The witness was temporarily unavailable.

Mr. Woodward called Gael Self to give testimony about an incident on September 19, 2010, when “Shamu” was running at large and attacked Richard Self who was on his property at the time. Mr. Woodward and the Board questioned Ms. Self.

Ms. Self was retained as a witness.

Mr. Woodward called Richard Self to give testimony about an incident on September 19, 2010, when “Shamu” was running at large and attacked Mr. Self who was on his property at the time. Mr. Woodward, Mr. Guarino and the Board questioned Mr. Self.

Mr. Self was retained as a witness.

Mr. Woodward reviewed documents and sworn statements relative to an incident on March 18, 2011, when “Shamu” was running at large and attacked Tyler Hayden who was on his property at the time. Mr. Woodward advised the three witnesses to this incident, Tyler Hayden, Diane Hayden and Jon Stires, were unable to attend the public hearing.

Mr. Woodward advised the Board that Richard Self and Gael Self observed “Shamu” running at large on March 18, 2011, around the time Tyler Hayden was attacked, and submitted sworn statements attesting to same.

Mr. Woodward did not call witnesses to give testimony relative to the incident involving Tyler Hayden on March 18, 2011.

Ms. Wittmer called for a recess at 8:35 PM.

Ms. Wittmer reconvened the hearing at 8:45 PM.

IV. Presentation of Dog Owner’s Case.

- A. County’s cross examination of each of the Dog Owner’s witnesses.
- B. Dog Owner’s direct examination of each of its witnesses.
- C. Board’s examination of each of the Dog Owner’s witnesses.

Mr. Guarino, who was not sworn, reviewed the incidents that occurred on November 29, 2009, June 24, 2010, September 19, 2010, and March 18, 2011.

Richard Self was recalled. Mr. Guarino questioned Mr. Self relative to the incident on March 18, 2011, and then about the incident on September 19, 2010.

Mr. Woodward and the Board questioned Mr. Self about the March 18, 2011, incident.

Richard Self was released as a witness.

Gael Self was recalled.

Mr. Guarino and the Board questioned Ms. Self relative to the March 18, 2011, incident.

Gael Self was released as a witness.

Carole Coleman was recalled. Mr. Guarino questioned Ms. Coleman relative to the dangerous dog investigation on his dog "Jenny".

Mr. Woodward questioned Ms. Coleman about her job duties and responsibilities relative to dangerous dog investigations and property inspections.

Carole Coleman was released as a witness.

V. Closing Statement by the County.

Mr. Woodward clarified the rabies vaccination records on Mr. Guarino's dogs relative to when those vaccinations were given. Mr. Woodward advised the investigation on "Shamu" was initiated by and based upon citizen complaints.

At the conclusion of Mr. Woodward's initial remarks the Board questioned both Mr. Guarino and Mr. Woodward.

Mr. Woodward made his final closing remarks by summarizing the investigation and asking the Board to uphold the dangerous dog declaration as based on the provisions in the Florida Statutes and the Seminole County Code.

VI. Closing Statement by the Dog Owner.

Mr. Guarino made closing remarks and asked the Board to void the dangerous dog declaration.

VII. Close of the evidentiary portion of the hearing.

Ms. Wittmer announced the evidentiary portion of the hearing was concluded.

A. Deliberation by the Board.

The Board began its deliberation to include clarifying the conditions to confine a dangerous dog.

Ms. Colby reviewed the definition of a dangerous dog. She advised the Board they must first make a finding as to whether or not the dog meets the definition of a dangerous dog. Second, the Board must decide if the dog inflicted a severe injury. And third, if the Board declares the dog to be dangerous they must establish conditions to confine the dog.

Ms. Wittmer called for a motion to declare the dog to be a dangerous dog.

Motion by Dr. Vaughan finding the dog "Shamu" is a dangerous dog pursuant to Florida Statutes, Chapter 767.11(d) based on incidents that occurred on September 19, 2010 (Richard Self incident); March 18, 2011(Tyler Hayden incident); and May 2, 2010

(Steve Oggeri incident); finding the dog did not inflict a severe injury; and ordering the dog to be confined with conditions specified in the Florida Statutes and the Seminole County code with additional conditions requiring the dog be spayed and be implanted with microchip identification. Second by Ms. Prince.

Motion made by and then rescinded by Ms. Hair to require training e.g. obedience training.

Dr. Vaughan's motion carried four votes (by Ms. Wittmer, Dr. Vaughan, Ms. Prince and Ms. Hair) to two votes (by Ms. Nagan and Ms. Garrambone).

B. Announcement of the Board's decision.

C. Direction to staff for preparation and issuance of the Board Order.

Ms. Wittmer directed the Clerk to prepare an order for her signature in accordance with the Board's decision.

VIII. Sunshine Law, Ethics and Public Records Training Conducted by Ann Colby, Assistant County Attorney.

There was a consensus to defer this training to the next Board meeting in consideration of the late hour.

IX. Confirmation of Next Meeting.

- June 9, 2011
- September 8, 2011
- December 8, 2011

X. Adjournment.

Motion by Ms. Hair to adjourn the meeting at 10:25 PM. Second by Ms. Prince.
The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Clerk to the Board

**SEMINOLE COUNTY
ANIMAL CONTROL BOARD
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
“UNOFFICIAL”
June 9, 2011
7:00 PM**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Gail Nagan
Marylin Wittmer, Chairman
Debra Garrambone
Kathleen Prince
Gayle Hair, Vice Chairman
Dr. Joe Vaughan
Keith Weissman

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

OTHERS: Morgan Woodward, Animal Services Manager
Ann Colby, Assistant County Attorney
Elaine RiCharde, Clerk to the Board

The following is a non-verbatim transcript of the Seminole County Animal Control Board meeting held June 9, 2011, at 7:00 PM, at the Sheriff's Office/Public Safety Building, 150 Bush Boulevard, Sanford, Florida.

I. Call to Order.

Ms. Wittmer called the meeting to order at 7:02 PM.

II. Roll Call.

Roll Call was taken by the Clerk. A quorum was present.

III. Minutes: March 10, 2011.

Ms. Wittmer asked if there were questions or discussion about the minutes.

Ms. Nagan said she had several changes. She then spoke directly to the Clerk asking if she told the Clerk to do this.

Ms. Wittmer asked Ms. Nagan to speak.

Ms. Nagan said for one thing she would like to suggest is it possible to have them numbered so it's easier, the pages.

Ms. Wittmer, Dr. Vaughan, Ms. Prince and Ms. Hair all said their minutes are numbered.

Ms. Nagan said oh you know why this is a print up from a computer. She said she hoped it was the same pagination. Ms. Nagan said on page three Debbie Bates spoke at the last meeting and she (meaning the speaker) has some changes. She said go to the sentence and then Ms. Nagan began to read as follows "I've also spent hours educating my neighbors and getting permission" when Ms. Wittmer asked her to give the Board an idea where it is she is reading. Ms. Nagan said page three. Ms. Wittmer replied she knew but the top of the page, middle of the page. Ms. Nagan said top of the page, sixth line, in the middle. Ms. Nagan said we have permission to get outside pets and it should be to have their outside quote pets unquote.

Ms. Wittmer asked Ms. Nagan to say it again.

Ms. Nagan read "I've also spent hours educating my neighbors and getting permission to get outside pets spayed or neutered". Ms. Nagan said instead of get outside it should be have their outside pets with pets in quotation.

Ms. RiCharde asked Ms. Nagan if she is saying get their outside pets and Ms. Nagan responded affirmatively.

Mr. Woodward said he was going to interject here. He said the way we're doing the minutes is not a verbatim record but the Clerk has diligently tried to put as much information in the minutes as possible. He said to be completely honest the meetings are recorded for a verbatim record and if Ms. Nagan would like a verbatim record he would be more than happy to supply her with a copy of the meeting for the \$5 cost.

Ms. Wittmer asked if that is for the tape.

Mr. Woodward said that is for the CD that we can now create. He said instead of spending hours and hours of typing out almost verbatim and then arguing over their outside parts with quotes versus something that generally states what that is, because that's what the minutes are, a general representation of what occurred at the meeting. Mr. Woodward said he personally has a problem with such detailed minutes because they're not supposed to be so detailed.

Ms. Wittmer said she would agree. She said there are no quotes in the minutes. She said she didn't know if anyone had transcribed anything from a tape but it's pretty difficult and not like a Dictaphone, it's a tape.

Ms. Nagan said her question is though she said she was reading the following verbatim statement.

Ms. Wittmer said but again this is not a verbatim transcript.

Ms. Nagan said well then maybe it should be verbatim (inaudible). She said one of the changes she thinks is important in the middle it says while (inaudible) cats killing birds and wildlife instead of inaudible it should be focusing on.

Ms. Wittmer said the point is the Clerk could not understand what was on the tape so she transcribed that she could not hear.

Ms. Nagan asked could the Clerk trust her (meaning herself) on her copy.

Ms. RiCharde asked for permission to speak. Ms. RiCharde said the speaker read from a script. She said if the speaker wanted the Clerk to get it word for word she should have provided the Clerk with a copy of the script which could have been scanned into a Word document.

Ms. Nagan asked the Clerk if she could give the Clerk what the speaker just gave her (meaning herself).

Ms. RiCharde replied that is not her decision.

Ms. Wittmer said this is nitpicky stuff. She asked if the Board could move on. She asked Ms. Nagan if there is something else.

Ms. Nagan said yes. She said when the speaker was done speaking she (meaning herself) asked the speaker a question how much she spent each year on page four then Ms. Nagan read from the minutes "that expenditures were out of the speaker's pocket." Ms. Nagan said the response is missing.

Ms. RiCharde said the response was not recorded.

Ms. Nagan said what did she mean it isn't recorded.

Ms. RiCharde said she cannot hear what they were saying in the audience. She said they have to be speaking into a microphone for her to be able to hear them.

Ms. Nagan said she was able to hear them on her copy and she did not know if it was Ms. RiCharde's computer or (inaudible).

Ms. RiCharde said she is not saying that. She said it was not recorded because the speaker was not sitting at the mic.

Ms. Nagan so even if it's on the tape you can't (inaudible).

Ms. RiCharde said she cannot hear it.

Ms. Wittmer said it's not on the tape, she can't hear it, she can't hear it on her tape.

Ms. Nagan said so she is just asking if she (meaning herself) can hear it on her computer is that good enough.

Ms. Wittmer said no, she didn't think so. She asked Ms. Nagan if there is anything else. Ms. Wittmer spoke directly to Ms. Nagan saying she is happy to have Ms. Nagan speak but she wanted to remind her Ms. Colby is supposed to be instructing the Board tonight on the Sunshine Laws so can we move it along a little bit.

Ms. Nagan said her other question actually was and she was told she had to ask the Board to reopen two past minutes because they were only four pages and not detailed at all. She said it would be up to this Board from July 2009 and September 2009.

Ms. Wittmer asked what was the nature of reopening it, is it something similar to this.

Ms. Nagan said no it's four pages where it could be forty. She said it used to be very summarized (inaudible) detailed at all so a lot of what people said wasn't on there

so people have no idea when Ms. Prince spoke over her saying there are some members on the Board who weren't on the Board two years ago.

Ms. Nagan said no last year.

Ms. Prince said to Ms. Nagan she said 2009.

Ms. Nagan said she meant 2010.

Ms. Prince said they were already passed.

Ms. Nagan said right and she found out from the county attorney through a commissioner's secretary that the only way it could be reopened to change them is if the Board agrees to it and that's why she's asking it.

Ms. Wittmer spoke directly to Ms. Nagan saying first of all she would ask, and she wanted to ask Ms. Colby when she asked this question, if this is appropriate. Ms. Wittmer spoke directly to Ms. Nagan saying when she (Ms. Nagan) speaks as a member of the Board and she says she talked to a county attorney and they said this that she, Ms. Nagan, document who she spoke to.

Ms. Nagan interrupted Ms. Wittmer saying she spoke to a commissioner's secretary.

Ms. Wittmer said OK but a name, have a name and exactly what they told you. Ms. Wittmer said for Ms. Nagan to just sit here and say I talked to so and so.

Ms. Nagan interrupted Ms. Wittmer and said that means you're not believing what she is saying.

Ms. Wittmer said well everybody has an interpretation. Ms. Nagan began to interrupt Ms. Wittmer saying she Emailed when Ms. Wittmer asked Ms. Colby if she could she could ask for that.

Ms. Nagan said she didn't have it with her.

Ms. Colby said she would be happy to clarify that for Ms. Wittmer. Ms. Colby said she received a request today (6/9/11) from Commissioner Van Der Weide's secretary. She said Ms. Nagan had posed a question as to whether or not the Commissioner could order the Board to go back and change the minutes of those particular meetings to be not just be the general four to six pages but to do them like these which is almost a verbatim or very close to a verbatim transcript. She said her answer was no, there is no authority for a commissioner to direct this Board to do anything. She said the Board, once it approves its minutes, has approved the minutes. She said if the Board wishes to go back and reopen those minutes in order to expand on them and then approve them once the expansion has been done, the Board may do so. Ms. Colby said that's up to the Board, that's not up to a commissioner to direct it.

Ms. Hair asked Ms. Colby if the Board along the way ran into a subject or topic where the Board felt they needed more information from a Board meeting a year ago the Board could go back and listen to the tape or something at that time.

Ms. Colby said sure.

Ms. Hair said if the Board had a specific reason today that there was a topic and there was some substantial information in the meeting last July that might be a good reason to look at it.

Ms. Colby said the Board could have the tape brought in and a segment listened to by the Board. She said she believed that what Ms. Nagan is asking for is the minutes to be reopened and the secretary be instructed to do essentially a verbatim transcript of each of those meetings.

Ms. Nagan made a remark that was inaudible, and Ms. Colby responded well a forty page summary of what happened.

Ms. Hair said it seemed to her the Board would be more effective if they didn't do that unless the Board had a specific reason to look back at something.

Ms. Wittmer said the Board would address this particular when Ms. Nagan spoke over her. Ms. Nagan said her reason is the people in the community would know what went on at those meetings.

Ms. Wittmer spoke directly to Ms. Nagan saying if she is interested in that to make a motion and see if there is a second and the Board would vote on it.

Motion by Ms. Nagan to open the July 2010 and September 2010 minutes. Ms. Wittmer called for a second. There was no second. The motion failed for lack of a second.

Ms. Wittmer called for additional discussion on the March 10, 2011, minutes. There was none.

Ms. Wittmer called for a motion to approve the March 10, 2011, minutes.

Motion by Dr. Vaughan to approve the minutes. Second by Ms. Prince. The motion carried five votes (by Mr. Wiessman, Ms. Wittmer, Dr. Vaughan, Ms. Prince and Ms. Hair) to one vote (by Ms. Nagan).

IV. Public Commentary.

Ms. Wittmer reminded the audience there is a three minute limit when they are speaking. She said there is a timer and when the timer goes off she would ask that speakers stop and sit down and have the next speaker come forward.

Debra Bates, 1017 Sarita Street, Sanford, addressed the Board about community unity in animal welfare. She read the following statement.² “Good evening. First and foremost, I would like to thank the recording secretary for doing a marvelous job of translating the minutes of these meetings...not only my humble words, but the verbal brawling of the board members which ensued during the last meeting. I have seen and taught preschoolers with far better manners than those I observed that night. When I initially stood before you, there was absolutely no doubt in my mind that you are a group in dire need of forward motivation. You felt so very threatened by the thought of individuals disagreeing with the ‘status quo’ that some of you decided to ‘stack the deck’ as it were, with Seminole County volunteers who showered praise on the efforts of our local animal control. Folks, NO ONE was there that night to denigrate the hard work done by the staff and volunteers of Animal Control who so altruistically donate their time and efforts to saving animals lives. Why would they? It is the self-same work that is being done by Seminole County citizens at their own expense to AVOID animals ending up in your facility to begin with. Why do you perceive us as the enemy? WE are the ones ‘in the trenches’ doing the grunt work of trapping, TNRing and feeding the ever increasing numbers of animals being abandoned and dumped in our county...both cats and dogs...left completely unable to fend for themselves in this lousy economy. We do everything within our means to help keep OTHERS from having to make the unconscionable decisions of who lives and who dies and it is the most divisive incivility for you or anyone to tell us true animal advocates we can’t complain about it; that we can’t fight for the animals, that we should sit down, shut up and allow the killing to continue. Do you honestly believe that without countless individual citizens complaining directly to our Board of County Commissioners that you would have chosen to forgo your edict forbidding citizens to speak prior to these meetings? Hardly. When you were expressly told to allow it; and in defiance of the people you have been chosen to represent, you then decided to limit our time to three minutes per person with a total time of 20 minutes. ONLY when the Commissioners, whom you have been chosen to represent, said to get rid of the 20 minute limit did you reconsider....ladies and gentlemen, WE WILL BE HEARD! Without the outcry of us lowly citizens, there would still be an ordinance allowing dogs to be tied to a tree 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Did YOU suggest carving it out for early action before the Board of Commissioners? No, once again, it was the constituency who made their outrage heard...otherwise, the

² Ms. Bates provided the Clerk with a copy of her text which differs slightly from her remarks. The text appears in the minutes.

status would happily have remained quo for you all. You need to remember, ladies and gentlemen, that you have been placed in positions of honor and responsibility to the citizens of this county. After the debacle of your last meeting, I am ashamed of all of you and embarrassed to think of you as representatives of Seminole County. You VOLUNTEERED to be SERVANTS of the public.... so act like the professional adults your commissioners believed you to be when they appointed you. If this is too stressful for you, if it takes up too much of your precious spare time, for goodness sake step down and allow someone in your place who truly has animals best interest at heart; who is not just busy being a puppet for someone else and patting themselves on the back for it. There are many others here willing and wanting; who truly believe that a no-kill solution is possible. Right now, it appears that this board prefers an 'express lane' to death row for strays and feral cats.....I am here to tell you here and now that your days are numbered."

Ms. Wittmer asked Ms. Bates for clarity's sake if her remarks were a positive or negative statement toward the Board.

Ms. Bates responded she could care less about the Board. She repeated she could really could care less about the Board. She said she cared about the animals. She said Seminole County does a great job at what they do we just need to do more.

Madeleine Mackenzie, 707 Glasgow Court, Winter Springs, addressed the Board about animal control hours.

Ms. Mackenzie said she is a member of Best Friends Sanctuary and gets their magazines and she has always been so impressed with what they are doing around the country and with different organizations and shelters and so forth. She said one of the things that seemed to affect an adoption rate is that shelters stay open during some evening hours so that people who are coming in from work can adopt. She said she wanted to propose perhaps that this shelter would stay open until say six thirty one evening a week and maybe come in later that morning or something so that there would be no extra expense on salaries and utilities and whatever.

Debra Garrambone joined the meeting at 7:16 PM.

Ms. Nagan spoke directly to Mr. Woodward asking if that could be done.

Mr. Woodward responded saying it was not for the Board to decide, they could make a recommendation to the Director of Public Safety, but it's not for the Board to decide. Dr. Vaughan spoke over Mr. Woodward saying the Board has no control over that.

Ms. Nagan said so should we make a recommendation.

Mr. Woodward responded the Board should probably listen to all the speakers then if there's a discussion.

Maureen Carroll, 642 Nighthawk Circle, Winter Springs, addressed the Board on animal hold time. She wrote on the speaker form "the short length of time from animal turned in until euthanization".

Ms. Carroll said she said she had a situation that occurred a few weeks ago that was very upsetting. She said a friend of her's who works in rescue and she were told about two little kittens who had mange. She said they were only a few weeks old and the woman tried to get a local vet to help and when she was turned away she just took the kitties to animal control. She said we found out about it a couple of hours later and she called and already within a very short period of time these little kitties had already been destroyed. She said she would like to know why just a short time. She said they really didn't need that much vetting they could have been fixed in no time and they were willing to spend their own money to have them vetted and have them treated properly. She said they were very young and it was just appalling that within a matter of hours they were already destroyed.

Marilyn Pagliaro, 675 Waneta Court, Winter Springs, addressed the Board about feral freedom program. She read the following statement.³ “I recently read a few articles about how one community in Florida is successfully resolving the community cat crisis. I believe this program is an appropriate one for Seminole County to consider not only to resolve our cat issues but also to reduce the drain on our limited county budget. Here are a few key points. This program is the feral freedom program in Jacksonville. It is an innovative, collaborative effort among the City of Jacksonville, Jacksonville Humane Society, First Coast No More Homeless Pets and Best Friends Animal Society to provide a humane solution of the burgeoning feral cat population. It is a massive endeavor to keep feral cats out of the shelter system through trap-neuter-return. The Director of Environmental Resource Management for the city who oversees Animal Care & Control has stated that ‘partnership with private companies is essential in the feral cat management arena’. Government cannot do it all. He also stated that ‘the partnership has dramatically reduced the number of cats requiring holding, increased live release,’ and reduced responding to complaint calls over time. All of this has saved resources for Animal Care & Control. Prior to this program, the traditional trap and kill had absolutely no effect on controlling the feral cat population. The cats they killed one day were replaced the next day by other cats. Education for all was the biggest part of the program. Some of the staff at Animal Care & Control was concerned about the response of the public since some people do not like cats at all. But, surprisingly, there were not a lot of complaint calls. In fact, the public totally supported the program. This was due to the public education provided by First Coast No More Homeless Pets. The volunteers went into neighborhoods to educate the people, listen and answer questions. They explained that sterilized cats cause far fewer nuisances as their unwanted behaviors decrease after neutering. In addition, after the cats were returned, the volunteers put informational brochures in the mailboxes of homes in the area to further educate the public. Another benefit was that as the public learned that the cats would not be killed, more people asked for help, thus controlling the population even more. Because of this program, thousands of feral cats were not killed which was a huge morale booster for the Animal Care & Control and shelter staff. The freed up kennel space allowed the staff to concentrate on the adoptable cats. And the community profile of Animal Care & Control had improved as they were now seen as solving the problem without killing healthy cats. I believe that this model program should be investigated to implement in Seminole County in order to improve how our community cats are treated and to save our community tax dollars.”

³ Ms. Pagliaro provided the Clerk with a copy of her text which differs slightly from her remarks. The text appears in the minutes.

Christine Logan, 300 Rose Drive, Sanford, addressed the Board about cat colonies. Ms. Logan distributed material she prepared on feral cat colonies. She provided the Clerk with copies of this material and requested the Clerk forward same to the Board of County Commissioners and Tad Stone, Public Safety Director. She read the following statement.⁴ “The debate about TNR and having free roaming cat colonies has been going on for years now. Every meeting that I have attended I have only heard from the people that want TNR. I have not heard from the people that do not want these cats out roaming in their yards, destroying wildlife, or putting people at risk for the many health problems these cats can cause. In March I started doing research on TNR. I discovered many interesting things which I have included in the booklet that I gave you. But the most important thing I found was that having free roaming cat colonies does not eliminate the problem. People keep abandoning their cats outside because TNR advocates and other misinformed people tell the public that the shelters just euthanize them. Which in fact shelters do everything they can to place animals back into homes. The belief that an animal is better off being abandoned outside where it can be hit by a car or die from an illness, versus going to a shelter or rescue where it is taken care of and people do all that they can do to find it a new home is very misguided. I also started visiting a colony that already exists, and I plan on visiting other colonies as well. I am documenting what I see and also taking pictures to show the public when I go out to educate people about this problem. What I found is very disturbing to me. Although the cats had plenty of food and water, I found so far cats that are very sick and one that is injured. Between the two feeding stations I saw six pregnant cats, and seven ear tipped cats. This colony sits in the center of a business district. Restaurants, stores, a hotel, and a bowling alley, direct contact with the public. It is obvious to me that these cats are not being medically taken care of. This means that they probably are not vaccinated for rabies. In one of my visits I saw two raccoons eating out of the cats’ food bowls. In my own experience trapping cats can be hard if not impossible to trap them all. This is a statement that was made by Alley Cat Allies. This group is one of the largest groups that support TNR. ‘It is important to note that cats pose virtually no rabies threat to humans. Rabies has been nearly eradicated from the dog and cat population in the U.S.; it has been a disease of wildlife since 1960. In 2006, only three human deaths were reported: two from bat bites, and one from a dog bite that occurred outside the United States.’”

⁴ Ms. Logan provided the Clerk with a copy of her text which differs slightly from her remarks. The text appears in the minutes.

Ms. Logan concluded by saying since these cats come into direct contact with raccoons their chances of getting rabies and spreading it to the public is a real serious problem.

Denise Scott, 1476 Whitehall Boulevard, Winter Springs, addressed the Board on public speaking/comments.

Ms. Scott said she wanted to know why we were only allowed to come and/or question at the beginning of a meeting. She said we should be allowed to ask questions as the meeting goes on or at the very least after the Board was done with their agenda. She said otherwise we have to wait three months for the next Board meeting. She said the comment that she thought Morgan (Woodward) made before about a printed version versus a taped version your printed version is a record. She said so if it was interpreted incorrectly the people are entitled to know that. She said so for Mr. Woodward to say that it's not a verbatim thing that's not really a good enough excuse. She said the other thing this was her second or third meeting she was attending and found you all to be arrogant and condescending and you want to get in here and in and out as fast as possible. She said she was wondering why the Board treats one of their Board members so badly. She said it makes her wonder what the Board would do to one of the residents of Seminole County.

Maggie Rosinia, 1221 Enderby Court,⁵ Chuluota, addressed the Board on anti-tethering June 1st law.

Ms. Rosinia said she knew the new law had gone into effect but she guessed her question is she tried to use it, it's not working too well. She said she reported two dogs this week and she really kind of got well let's see the response was it's OK for a dog to be chained still as long as the chain is inside the garage. She said this dog has been there for years chained inside of a garage with a chain in the garage and he comes out a little bit out of the garage. She said well can he get in the garage. She said well I need you to send somebody over. She said I don't need to play sixty questions. She said this dog has been there for years. She said the garage is so full of garbage she didn't know if there was room or not. She said she has been to the house, she has

⁵ Ms. Rosinia wrote her address on the speaker form as 1221 Enderby Court. When speaking to the Board she announced her address as 1121 Enderby Court.

approached the owners, she has offered to help, see if they needed food, could we put a fence up for them in the back, something. She said she was adamant, she was mad. Ms. Rosinia said can the dog fit inside the garage she didn't know. She said go see. She said another dog is on Harrison and Reed. She said there's been a German Shephard in the back yard for years. She said the people have a shack there's no other word for it. She said there's a dog in the front yard. She said that's the one that had the Pug that digs a hole so deeply that she just saw the head sticking out and she thought it had been decapitated previously. She said they call me back there's no dog perhaps it's in the house did you knock on the door. She said the dog house and the chains are in the front yard. She said what about the dog in the back yard oh I don't know. She said she meant, she guessed what she's thinking is it took so long for this rule to come to pass and it's for the animals and she knows that. She said she read that, the overview and she guessed she is surprised she didn't see what the fine is for first offense, second offense. She said she didn't know if the Board could tell her that or she was missing that. She said penning a dog out in the heat she didn't see that in the body of it. Ms. Rosinia said she was not being critical she knew it had taken a long time and the Board is probably still tweaking it but she didn't know if maybe we couldn't do a better job. She said she talked to an Oviedo cop and said you know the other day she said you know there's an anti-chaining law or anti-tethering the word you use. He said no, he didn't know. She said you know it's kind of hard to enforce or even call you. She said once again she knew this took time but trying to be constructive so she knew you didn't usually answer but was she looking in the wrong place where the fines are. She said how many times you guys have to go to the house. She said and it's OK to leave a dog chained in the garage which was nowhere in the paper work she saw. She said but the dispatcher told her it was OK. She said so that was her overview on the chaining and she didn't know if maybe she was supposed to call your office (speaking directly to Mr. Woodward) if someone could.

Mr. Woodward responded he had Ms. Rosinia's name and address and would contact her.

Ms. Rosinia said she needed to know what the rules are so maybe we can maybe help educate everybody.

Phyllis Ayoob, 572 Seminole Woods Boulevard, Geneva, addressed the Board about the no kill nation conference.

Ms. Ayoob said on Tuesday she was in Jacksonville and spoke with Rick DuCharme who founded the feral freedom program. She said it is working wonderfully. She said not only do they not kill any feral cats that come into animal control they spay neuter them, return them to where they came from they also now are taking any cat that is deemed unadoptable, friendly or not. She said if it's considered unadoptable they are also being spayed and neutered and returned to where they came from. She said they have had not one complaint since January about the program. She said it's working wonderfully. Ms. Ayoob said Best Friends came down to them to learn how they run their program. She said the program is now being copied in Atlanta and Best Friends gave them a grant to pay trappers thirteen dollars an hour to go up there and trap cats and get them fixed. She said the end of July there's a group of county residents going to the no kill nation conference in Washington D.C. She said we would like to know if we can be put on the September agenda to talk about what we find when we get up to the conference so we can share our information with the Board.

Lisa Reddy, 699 Green Turtle Court, Geneva, addressed the Board about Lake Mary feral cats.

Ms. Reddy said she was here to thank Morgan (Woodward) and Tad (Stone) for notifying her, Friends of Feral Animals, about the issues with a colony in Lake Mary. She said there were some problems and they were able to mediate it, get the colonies taken care of and to date everyone is happy which was great and she was very happy about that. She said as a matter of fact it has led to an invitation from a condo association in Heathrow to address their feral cat colony issues as well. She said they are interested in TNR, trap-neuter-return, for the colony rather than trap and kill and hopefully we will be able to help them as well. She said thanks again for that and we look forward to working with you in the future.

Ms. Reddy said for the record and then she spoke directly to Christine Logan who earlier addressed the Board. Ms. Reddy said "Ms. Logan, feral cats that are taken into animal control are not adopted out they are put down. Six hundred and thirty three cats were brought in in May and four hundred and eighty seven were put down. The shelter is not a shelter for feral cats."

Maria Bolton-Joubert, 1128 Covington Street, Oviedo, addressed the Board. She wrote on the speaker form “accomplishments and comment w/dog on Sugarberry in Oviedo 1103 Sugarberry Drive suggested w/hours of operation.”

Ms. Bolton-Joubert said she was just going to go over what she does to help with the community. She said she’s been walking dogs over at Aloma Jancy which is an animal ...

Ms. Bolton-Joubert stopped speaking and asked to re-start the minutes because she had a lot to say. She said someone interrupted her.

Ms. Wittmer directed the Clerk to restart the timer.

Ms. Bolton-Joubert said she just wanted to go over what well first of all she wanted to thank you for Tad (Stone) and Morgan (Woodward) for all the animals you have helped place and adopt cats and dogs. She said she hasn’t looked on the web site in a while to see who’s been adopted but she’s sure you’ve got a good number going so thanks for all those that you have saved. She said she wanted to talk about what she does. She said she’s been helping walk dogs over at Aloma Jancy Animal Hospital the last eight months so she’s been donating about two days a week since the last eight months about two hours each time walking dogs for a rescue called A New Beginning also for Cheryl Lynn’s (sic) rescue which is Ruff World and also for another organization called Save a Life. She said so she helps with those three groups and more so within the last eight months specifically them. She said she donates her time towards peacefully protesting the different puppy stores that are here in town. She said her goal was to ultimately to drive them crazy and to get them out of here because it makes her upset that they are making so much money off of breeding these animals while good animals are being put down at the S.P.C.A., the shelter, wherever, held on Craig’s List. She said she’s been donating her time the last three years over at the Orlando S.P.C.A. doing graphic design work for them for different brochures and flyers, some of their digital online work Wine for Whiskers, the Wiggle Waggle Walk. She said she donates her time to different animal organizations doing graphic design work for free, different flyers, events, fund raisers. She said that was tying her into maybe she could help you guys try to come up with some fundraisers throughout the year to try to get people out to the S.P.C.A. and bring some more attention to your animals. She said

she'd love to help you guys as well. She said she used to live in Orlando which was why she helped them still. She said she knew Robin (sic) out there, she's a great gal. She said she thought that would be a really good way to try to bring more people out and be aware of the types of animals that you have out at your location. She said then like Madeleine (sic) said maybe you guys can be open a little bit longer, maybe even a ten to seven just because that way people who have a regular nine to five their kids say "Hey, let's go adopt an animal" the shelter you guys would be open or even saying hey let's be open both days on the weekend or maybe a solid day on the weekend because again typical jobs are nine to five and people probably eighty per cent of the population have off on the weekends so that'd be a good way to say "Hey, let's go to the shelter and try to go adopt an animal today." She said she realized we're running out of time. She said she helped push the bestiality bill that finally passed. She said she didn't know if you guys know what that is. She said she called, petitioned, wrote letters and the most upsetting thing was last summer that guy in Bithlo that sodomized his dog that they finally euthanized so after she found out there was someone so close to her having sex with his dog that they had to put down she said "How is it not illegal in the State of Florida to have sex with your dog?". She said so finally that bill passed no more of that, it's criminalized, which makes her happy. She said she helps on legislative type stuff, protesting peacefully, everything within legal limits. She said again she wanted to help you guys advertise some more fundraising events, maybe you could extend your hours and thanks for what you're doing and maybe discount spay and neuters for people.

Ms. Prince asked to speak and Ms. Wittmer consented.

Ms. Prince spoke directly to Ms. Bolton-Joubert saying there is a new volunteer orientation on July 9th that she could go to and get with Diane (Gagliano) to go through the whole program so then she would have free rein to do whatever you wanted to do.

Ms. Bolton-Joubert responded she would be limited to help you guys because she is also (inaudible) chair of the local Sierra Club so she is also trying to do a lot. She again said she also wanted help you guys and asked what day was that.

Ms. Prince responded July 9th at 9:00 in the morning.

Ms. Bolton-Joubert said unfortunately she would be on vacation and asked if Ms. Prince happened to know of another one.

Ms. Prince responded that is the only one she knew of that is scheduled right now.

V. Old Business.

Ms. Wittmer asked if Diane (Gagliano) is the volunteer coordinator.

Mr. Woodward responded saying Diane (Gagliano) is the volunteer coordinator and he suggested touching base with her.

Numerous people began speaking simultaneously and their remarks were disjointed.

Ms. Wittmer called for comments from the Board.

Ms. Nagan asked to speak and Ms. Wittmer consented.

Ms. Nagan then spoke directly to Christine Logan who earlier addressed to the Board. Ms. Nagan said she appreciated what she said. She said she wanted to clarify one thing. She said stray cats that are socialized are not feral cats. She said they are two different types of cats and she didn't know if Ms. Logan was aware of that. Ms. Nagan said feral cats are untamed. Ms. Nagan said one hundred per cent are put down, they cannot be adopted out to families.

There followed a disjointed conversation between Ms. Nagan and Ms. Logan who was sitting in the audience.

Ms. Nagan said she agreed with Ms. Logan that there are a lot of adoptable cats out there in the feral colonies. She said the colony Ms. Logan saw was not a good managed colony and she agreed with Ms. Logan on that. She said they have to be fixed, if a new cat comes they have to be fixed. She said maybe you all (sic) could get together later or whenever and come to some solution. She said just a suggestion. She said she appreciated Ms. Logan's hard work. She said this must have taken a long time.

Ms. Wittmer called for comments from the Board.

Ms. Hair asked to speak and Ms. Wittmer consented.

Ms. Hair said first she wanted to say she always loves people who have a passion about animals. She said her passion is horses and even though her passion is not the same as theirs she really loved it that they do have a passion. She said one of the things that she would like them to do is ... when they were talking about the feral program in Jacksonville that was working so well. She said what she heard was the citizens met with some private people and got together a way to fund some of this stuff, and then they coordinated with the animal services there. She asked was that right. Ms. Hair said what she would really enjoy seeing would be all of those who have that passion about the feral cats if they could come together with a plan of how it could work in Seminole County, although feral cats are not her passion, she would love to hear what they could put together. She said if they put together something she would like for the Board to hear what the plan would be. She said that was what we have to do with rescued horses. She said feeding a big old horse that is loose in Seminole County it is not easy finding a place for him. She said she understands the hardship. She said the horse people try to work together to figure out how they are going to feed that horse or where they are going to put it and we beg, borrow and steal to support our passion. She said if they could get together, all of them, instead of singularly, get together as a group and try to come up with a plan she would come to meetings. She said she would enjoy seeing them work together, find a way to make it work in Seminole County.

Mr. Woodward asked to speak. Ms. Wittmer consented.

Mr. Woodward said he can say that knowing how the program works in Jacksonville there are multiple non-profit agencies that raise money on their own behalf for this specific program. He said it is not run by animal control, it is not run by the spay/neuter facility, it is not run by a specific group. He said it is a group of individuals or a group of organizations that came together for a common goal. He said he believed here in Seminole County we already tried that. He said Lisa Reddy addressed briefly their group, Friends of Ferals. He said approximately two years ago the Board had long discussions about forming a non-profit organization and they have done that. He said we were kind of lying dormant for a while but we have recently touched base once again to try and re-start that fire. He said we are working with Friends of Ferals to try and start that communication process. He said here is a situation and let's see if we can get in there, address the situation the right way and then after that situation is addressed or we feel it is being adequately monitored let's take on another project. He said we have already identified another location which we can get them involved with. He said we are just planning on going in that direction. He said we hear what they are saying but we really do need other organizations to develop and come together to be able to work together because it cannot be just Friends of Feral Animals, it cannot just be Seminole County Animal Services. He said it has to be Seminole County that is coming together to do this.

Ms. Hair spoke directly to Mr. Woodward. She said the people with the passion need to work a plan and then he will do what he has to do to fit into their plan if they come up with a good plan. She said they have to put the plan together first.

Mr. Woodward said he believed all of us working together could develop that plan but there needs to be organizations that are self funded to help run those programs. He said you cannot rely on the county to pay for all these programs because there is no more money. He said there are no new programs that are going to be developed for a long time to come.

Ms. Garrambone said she thought that was how the Board came up with the low cost spay neuter that did come about, that the county did go for with the S.P.C.A. She said that kind of came out of it, that small part, what the Board was able to do.

Ms. Nagan said she would like to say what has been going on for years people have been paying some ten, twelve thousand a year out of their own pocket but we do need more of the county's support.

Ms. Hair said she thought you could get the county's support if you get the people, everybody organized, working together.

Dr. Vaughan asked if they own the property couldn't they do whatever they want with an agriculture (zoning) and put as many cats as they wanted. He asked whose property are these animals on.

Mr. Woodward responded a lot times ... the one in particular he knows about that Lisa Reddy addressed was multiple areas, some of it was private property, some it was public property.

Ms. Wittmer asked if didn't the Board have a big presentation about this a couple of years ago, that Mr. Woodward was talking about, where the Board was presented with the pros and some of the organizations that were going to form non-profits and develop this.

Mr. Woodward responded Friends of Ferals was developed and it took them a while to get their non-profit status. He said he believed it was obtained about a year ago and then the flame kind of died, we lost that passion for the program. He said recently we tried to reignite that passion and put something together and it was starting out nicely. He said we have not had any formal meetings as to what was done, but placing that call and having that line of communication of hey, here's the problem that we have, a continuing problem, can you help, we need help. He said we are tired of going out there and just trapping and bringing them back here and having them euthanized. He said let's see what we can do to benefit everybody.

Ms. Wittmer asked for comments regarding the speaker who asked to be on the September agenda to make a presentation.

Motion by Dr. Vaughan to put the speaker on the September agenda. Second by Ms. Prince.

Ms. Hair said she would like to see it on the agenda if the purpose of it is to bring the Board up to date on what they are all doing as a group, getting to know each other, working on it, expanding the friends of feral cats or joining the friends or something. She said she would like to hear that.

Ms. Wittmer asked, and not because she is against doing it, but if the Board does that should the Board need to have the other side make presentations, people who are against it.

Mr. Woodward said he thought that if it is just for the speaker to present what was presented at the conference he did not think so.

The Clerk clarified Dr. Vaughan's motion that Phyllis Ayoob, who spoke about the no kill nation conference, that she will be the speaker on the September agenda ... The Clerk was interrupted by audience members who began addressing the Board.

Ms. Wittmer addressed the audience asking for them to get together and have one speaker.

The Clerk resumed speaking saying the presentation would be on the no kill nation conference feedback. Ms. Wittmer asked Dr. Vaughan if that was correct and he agreed.

An audience member began addressing the Board to which Ms. Wittmer responded the Board has to talk about that, the Board has to decide on two possible dates for the September meeting.

Ms. Wittmer asked if the Board was clear on the motion then called for a vote. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Nagan said she has question for Morgan about this topic. She asked did somebody move forward and say (inaudible) are controversial to the county wanting to work together because the new ordinance about the owner that now we're taking care of feral cats, we're the owner where before we weren't.

Mr. Woodward asked how that was any different than what was currently on the books.

Ms. Nagan replied currently owner has a very short definition, it does not say that if you have been caring for an animal for thirty days or more you own it. She said that is all new (inaudible). That's all new as well as (inaudible).

Mr. Woodward responded at this point he thought that is for the Board of County Commissioners to decide when it is presented to them. He said that was already discussed among the Board and voted on unless he was mistaken.

Ms. Nagan said right, OK.

Ms. Wittmer called for additional old business.

Mr. Weissman asked to speak and Ms. Wittmer consented.

Mr. Weissman said the lady talking about the Oviedo officer who did not know the law, he would take it upon himself to look into that. He said a lot of new cops are coming in and they do not know a lot of this stuff.

Mr. Woodward said he would make a comment not to mistake state statutes with local ordinances. He said these are ordinances that are passed for the animal services code, section twenty. He said law enforcement while they can enforce that section of it but primarily that was written for the Animal Services Officers to go out and enforce. He said they may not be educated or made aware of the specific ordinance that is there, they should be aware of it.

Mr. Weissman said we get so many new laws coming in and asked who knew about the move over left or move over law and not a lot of people knew about it. He said officers get bombarded with new laws and everything else and please don't take it personally if we don't know. He said he would make sure.

Ms. Wittmer spoke directly to Mr. Woodward about the lady who had problems with calls and asked him to get with her.

Mr. Woodward responded he would.

Ms. Nagan asked to speak under old business about dangerous dogs. Ms. Wittmer consented.

Ms. Nagan said she had two things she would like to suggest. She said one was after the Board hears all the evidence if the Board could take a break then for at least ten minutes. She said last time she felt rushed and she did not get to get all her thoughts together and she thought she would be more prepared to explain her reasoning on (inaudible) it was a dangerous dog.

Ms. Wittmer said she thought the Board took a break, she did not know exactly when.

Ms. Nagan said it was very much earlier on before the Board had all the evidence. She said it was just one suggestion.

Ms. Nagan said the other would be the Board could actually meet the dog that was being put on trial (sic). Ms. Nagan said she put it upon herself to meet the dog after the hearing. She said a couple of years ago when the Board wanted to raise the fee to five hundred it upset her. She said there are only six families in Seminole County and three of them have two dogs each. She said it upset her that they were not going to be notified so she went to all their houses. She said she was kind of shocked that these dogs were sweet, friendly dogs that were declared dangerous and she would like to pass around pictures of her first meeting with them.⁶ She said she thought it was important because the Board was affecting these people's lives. She said like these two Dobermans that were declared in 2002 they are old now, they are only paying fifty dollars a dog. She said you're talking an older couple on Social Security, on a limited, fixed income. Ms. Nagan said their dogs actually never did anything but the Board a couple of people on the Board now were on then and they were even asked individually do you think the dog is dangerous, everybody said no, it's not, they're not but they can be perceived as dangerous. She said she didn't think that was the way the law was intended to be.

Ms. Wittmer asked Ms. Nagan what is it she wanted the Board to do.

Ms. Nagan said she thought the Board needed to research more before the Board just decides to raise the fee from just fifty a year to five hundred. She said some people that's a thousand. She said see here you can see, you want to pass it (sic).

Ms. Wittmer said she thought the Board already discussed that.

Ms. Nagan said everything can always be brought up, the Board can discuss it, like not about these dogs but about going ahead in the future. She said you can see these dogs are not dangerous. She said she thought if the Board can meet the dog that

⁶ Ms. Nagan passed among the Board members two pictures of herself posing with dangerous dogs that were neither restrained nor confined nor muzzled. One picture was with two dogs, "Harley" and "Davis", owned by Teri Ducsay. The other picture was with "Shamu", one of two dangerous dogs owned by Joseph Guarino.

is on trial (sic) that is more fair. She said this is also, this is probably she meant she did work with attorneys for years, she is not an attorney but she did a lot of research and other things so she is not just talking like she does not know anything. She said she is not sure if it is the board (sic) she needs to talk to or an attorney but she really does not agree with the way the Board is interpreting the dangerous dog law. She said the definition for menacing she was under the impression it meant like annoying like Dennis the Menace type. She said she looked in a legal dictionary and it actually means threatening like the dog is actually threatening you, coming at you viciously. She said not that the dog is running toward you and you are afraid of it because it could be running toward you to play. She said she thinks the Board is punishing people because their dogs get out a lot which is wrong they shouldn't, but the Board should fine the owner and not declare the dog dangerous that is totally not dangerous. She said she is also very upset that when, and then Ms. Nagan spoke directly to Mr. Woodward saying Morgan, when you write a letter when people want to appeal your decision you tell them that they can appeal but the Animal Control Board can go further and declare the dog to be euthanized. She said she found that nowhere in the ordinance, in the statute. She said the only time the Board could declare a dog to be euthanized would be if he (meaning Mr. Woodward) said it first and on appeal the Board agreed or the dog was already a dangerous dog. She said not a first time when the dog is only being declared dangerous by him (meaning Mr. Woodward). She said the Board cannot on an appeal, as far as what she is reading, decide to euthanize it and if she is wrong Ms. Colby or somebody else could correct her. She said she looked at this, she got other people, attorneys' opinions. She said maybe it is vague so different attorneys interpret it differently, but that's her opinion.

Ms. Colby said there are circumstances under which a dog that is found to be dangerous could be euthanized on the initial hearing. She said that depends upon what the dog is doing. She said if the dog kills a human being, if the dog seriously injures, and again you have to look at the definition of that, seriously injures or maims a human being then yes, they can be euthanized or the Board can decide that the dog should be appropriately euthanized.

Ms. Nagan spoke directly to Ms. Colby saying she didn't see it anywhere on the first time here and if Ms. Colby should show it to her she would appreciate it.

Dr. Vaughan said he remembered when the Board put a dog to sleep that ripped the skin or the hair off a nine year boy who was scalped and the dog was put to sleep by a unanimous from the Board.

Ms. Nagan said she what she is saying is if this dog "Shamu" (supra) who did not bite or hurt anybody and you know we all were at well you weren't at this hearing for this dog, Morgan in his letter is telling them they can appeal his decision to declare it dangerous but that the Board ... she said she feels we can say yes it is even if Morgan says no it isn't but in his letter he says the Board can decide to have the dog euthanized.

Ms. Wittmer said she thought that was true.

Ms. Nagan said that was not anywhere in here.

Ms. Colby said it depends entirely, what Mr. Woodward is talking about is, that is the law allows it if certain facts are proven. She said if those facts are not proven and in this particular case the dog was not shown to have killed anyone or maimed anyone and appropriately the Board, even though it felt it met the definition of a dangerous dog, did not order the dog euthanized and the Board could not have.

Ms. Nagan so then that is her point it shouldn't be in the letter that the people get because she thinks that keeps a lot of people from appealing. She said you know what she is saying. She said Morgan should not have that sentence in his letter to the people.

Ms. Wittmer said but that is part of the law.

Ms. Nagan said it isn't.

Ms. Colby said she would be happy to review the letter and see if it complies with the law.

Ms. Nagan said she also feels that like she said before that the one year old Labrador did bite a child, he needed a couple of stitches but he wasn't just standing around he was trying to push the dog into the other yard so it's not like he was just standing there. She said he was provoking the dog. She said again you all disagreed with her but it says severe injury means any physical injury resulting in broken bones, multiple bites or disfiguring lacerations requiring sutures or reconstructive surgery. She said it means multiple stitches, it means disfiguring lacerations (inaudible).

Ms. Wittmer said that was not the definition of what a dangerous dog is.

Ms. Nagan said no that's the definition for the word severe injury which is what Morgan used to declare that dog dangerous.

Ms. Wittmer said she was reading directly from the Florida Statutes then read "Dangerous dog means any dog that according to the records of the appropriate authority has aggressively bitten comma attacked comma or endangered or has inflicted severe injury on a human". She said those are all oars (sic).

Ms. Nagan said she agreed but Morgan's finding for that dog was that he inflicted severe injury that was in his paper she read the whole (inaudible) so she is saying that dog did not meet the definition for severe injury. She said and why would you have to aggressively bite and then just one to someone and dangerous you know what she is saying.

Ms. Wittmer said Ms. Colby said she will review the letter.

Ms. Nagan said OK it's just very contradictory.

Ms. Colby said understand that Morgan makes a judgment on a dog. She said the reason the Board exists is to allow an owner to challenge that. She said if the owner doesn't feel they do not meet the definitions properly they come to the Board and the Board has a full evidentiary hearing where the Board as a group decides what the facts are and whether or not those facts meet the definition of a dangerous dog, that's why the Board exists.

Ms. Nagan said again if he has that sentence in there that the Board can decide to euthanize the dog instead a lot of people when Ms. Colby spoke over her saying she believed she (meaning herself) just said she would review that to make sure it does in fact comply with the statutes.

Ms. Wittmer said OK let's move on.

Ms. Wittmer called for additional old business. There was none.

VI. New Business.

Ms. Wittmer called for new business.

Ms. Prince asked to speak and Ms. Wittmer consented.

Ms. Prince passed around pictures to the Board members and said she wanted to let the other Board members know she spent a little time at the shelter this week and she wanted to show the Board members the new dog yard meet and greet with the new shade they put up. She said it makes it so much nicer for people. She said it makes a huge difference in the temperature in the yard and it is going to make a big difference in helping the public come and see who they want. She said she also took pictures of the cool outdoor cat enclosure that they also have.

Ms. Nagan asked we're doing new business.

Ms. Wittmer replied yes.

Ms. Nagan said she has one item. She said there is an organization in Winter Park for lost pets but they cover the entire Central Florida area. She said you can go to their web site Winter Park lost pets. She said she thought it is for everybody here as well to spread the news. She said their web site is they post a lot of lost pets and found pets. She said they only started in 2009 and as of yesterday they reunited their two hundredth animal with their family so she thought that is really great. She said so you can see they only have two listed now that were found but you should all take a look because you might you know someone that lost it. She said they started in Winter Park but now are all around here. She said they have two and a half of pages of lost that are still lost. She said they might be at animal control, S.P.C.A. and somebody's home that rescued them. She said they also have a link on their web site for animal control and S.P.C.A. in Orange and Seminole. She said Orange County recently put a link to them on their web site so she was wondering if Seminole County could do that as well so when people don't find their dog in Seminole they click on this link and they see if somebody has it in the home from Winter Park lost pets. She asked if she made a motion to suggest that.

Dr. Vaughan said yes, go ahead.

Motion by Ms. Nagan to suggest that the county gets with Winter Park lost pets and allows a link put on our web site so when people lose an animal they can click on the (inaudible). Second by Ms. Prince.

Dr. Vaughan asked what was the deal with that.

Ms. Wittmer spoke directly to Mr. Woodward asking if that is OK.

Mr. Woodward responded we would have to make sure we are not advertising for the agency.

Ms. Nagan spoke directly to Mr. Woodward saying you have other things on your web site.

Mr. Woodward responded yes but we're not advertising for them. He said we have a link to Petfinder and all he is saying is we have to make sure we're not advertising for them.

Dr. Vaughan said why not let them take a look at it.

There followed multiple, disjointed conversations among the Board members.

Mr. Woodward said there are a thousand and one of them out there and if that is what he needs to put on his page then he'll put them all on there.

Ms. Nagan said this is a really big one now and there's also home again and it seems like they're getting really big, they're all over Facebook and since 2009 two hundred animals (inaudible).

Ms. Wittmer said that is something for Morgan to look into.

Mr. Woodward said actually that would be a recommendation to the Director.

Ms. Nagan asked could she make a motion then to recommend to the Director.

Dr. Vaughan spoke directly to Ms. Nagan saying she already did and it was seconded.

Ms. Wittmer called for a vote. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Wittmer called for any additional new business. There was none

Mr. Weissman left the meeting at this time (8:50 PM).

A. Sunshine Law, Ethics and Public Records Training Conducted by Ann Colby, Assistant County Attorney.

Ms. Colby reminded the Board training relative to the Sunshine Law, ethics and public records is being done at the direction of the Board of County Commissioners for all boards. She distributed a package of information on the subject matter.

Ms. Colby identified the documents in the package to include a pamphlet from the Florida Commission on Ethics, copies of Florida Statutes, a copy of Form B (voting conflict), an outline/overview on the subject matter, a hard copy of a Power Point presentation on the subject matter and a true/false test she will administer at the conclusion of the training. She then proceeded to conduct the training session.

Ms. Wittmer called for a recess at 9:00 PM.

Ms. Wittmer reconvened the meeting at 9:07 PM.

Ms. Colby resumed the training session.

At the conclusion of Ms. Colby's training Ms. Nagan asked if she and Mr. Woodward could take two minutes to clear the air about something that had to do with her being on the Board.

Ms. Garrambone spoke directly to Ms. Nagan saying she could do that after the meeting because it is not a Sunshine violation.

Ms. Colby spoke directly to Ms. Nagan saying she could talk to Mr. Woodward all she wanted to.

Ms. Nagan said she wanted this to be on the record and this will be quick.

Mr. Woodward spoke directly to Ms. Nagan saying he was making a general inquiry, as a Board member making an inquiry for somebody else for information that is a public record to get that information without having to pay for it.

Ms. Nagan began to respond saying she never said she did when Mr. Woodward spoke over her saying he never said she did, he was asking the question.

Ms. Colby said if a Board member requests information that has to do with Board matters which will be distributed to everybody as part of their packet you can do that. She said if you make a public records request for every memo that has the word the in it or a public records request for a set of documents or a set of opinions or records going back to when, then as a public records request that's not directly related to Board decisions that will be made and is not necessary for each Board member in their packet then it's a straight up public records request and you would have to pay for it.

Ms. Nagan said she never asked (inaudible).

Ms. Wittmer spoke directly to Ms. Nagan saying she thought she (meaning Ms. Nagan) and Morgan should discuss this.

Mr. Woodward spoke directly to Ms. Nagan saying they can discuss this some time.

Ms. Wittmer said you don't need to discuss this at a meeting.

Ms. Nagan said she thought it needed to be on record though because if it's not then she's always accused of lying.

Ms. Wittmer said no, she didn't think so.

Ms. Nagan said just for the record she did not want any favors because she is on the Board and she has never asked for it and she was accused of that twice now by Morgan so that is for the record.

Mr. Woodward said he did not believe he mentioned any names.

Ms. Wittmer OK.

Ms. Nagan spoke directly to Mr. Woodward saying I asked you when multiple Board members began speaking and their conversations were disjointed.

Ms. Wittmer gaveled the meeting to order.

Ms. Colby spoke directly to Ms. Nagan saying if she had a problem with how Morgan has handled anything to please tell his supervisor, bring it up with his supervisor.

B. Future Agenda Items.

Ms. Wittmer said one of the members of the audience talked about maybe extending the hours or adjusting the hours maybe one day a week at animal control and just maybe put that on a future agenda the Board did not have to discuss it tonight.

Mr. Woodward said he believed he brought that to the Board and he demonstrated that we took eleven months and evaluated the individuals that came in during the hours of five and six.

Ms. Wittmer asked did we talk about it.

Mr. Woodward said we made note as to the reason why they were coming in and we noted that the big request was for returning lost and stray animals back to their owners. He said what we were finding was maybe one individual a week was coming in to redeem their dog between the hours of five and six. He said very few animals were being looked at in adoption between five and six.

Ms. Garrambone said it may need to be later because between five and six was the dinner hour it could be like maybe seven.

Mr. Woodward asked if she was going to pay the extra wages.

Ms. Garrambone said she thought what they were saying was maybe there was a chance of opening later, not to stay open a longer day but is there a day maybe you can open at ten. She said she knew you need to have an officer on call.

Ms. Wittmer addressed a member of the audience saying she saw their hand up but there was no public discussion.

Mr. Woodward said he adjusted the hours of when someone can come in and look for their animal between the hours of eight to ten. He said normally we were closed until ten o'clock and they weren't allowed to come in and look for their animal until ten o'clock. He said he has noticed several animals a day are being reclaimed between the hours of eight and ten as compared to one or two a week maybe between the hours of five and six. He said he thought it is a lot more convenient to the public by offering the ability to be able to come in at eight o'clock rather than five o'clock.

Ms. Garrambone asked you were opening at ten and now you're opening at eight.

Mr. Woodward replied adoption opens at ten but for lost and stray animals to be able to walk through the stray kennels with his staffing levels he's able to get that portion of the kennels open at eight o'clock and we can take people through to do a stray escort and if the animal is in the shelter we can go ahead and do the paperwork to get that animal back to them at that time. He said it seems a lot more convenient to the public rather than having them come in at eight thirty thinking they can just go to the back when they have to wait around till ten. He said it was just a huge inconvenience.

Ms. Colby said one of the problems that we have is that there have been directives issued for closure of buildings at particular times so they can shut off the systems. She said they're not as flexible about extending hours or changing hours as they used to be because of those concerns.

Ms. Garrambone said keeping the courthouse running is a lot more than keeping Animal Services building running.

Ms. Colby said that's for security, they can't allow people in. She said it's one thing to keep an empty building secure. She said if you have people in there you have

to have personnel there to monitor those people and they still turn the heating and air conditioning off at a particular time.

Ms. Wittmer called for additional future additional items.

The Clerk asked for clarification if that was something the Board wants to discuss.

Ms. Wittmer asked for input from the Board.

Ms. Garrambone asked to discuss at a meeting and go over the hours Animal Services has now and maybe some stats (inaudible).

Ms. Colby said the Board could certainly discuss it and make a recommendation to Tad (Stone) who could make a recommendation to the Board who could do whatever they want.

Ms. Wittmer asked if she is the only one who wanted to do that.

Ms. Garrambone said no she didn't think so she would like to go through the hours they're open, what they're doing when, when they're open.

Ms. Hair said they are open on Saturday, if people can't come in during the week they can come in on Saturday

Ms. Wittmer said OK we don't have to do it.

Ms. Hair said she would rather spend the money on doing something else.

VII. Reports.

Ms. Wittmer asked if anyone had any questions rather than going through everyone of them.

Ms. Garrambone asked how long is the holding period if you get an animal in on Monday are they all there on Saturday.

Mr. Woodward said there was nothing that required him to hold it any particular amount of time but however what we typically will do is we will hold it for five days. He said we don't count the day that it comes in and we don't count Sunday. He said so technically if it comes in on a Wednesday it's evaluated on the following Wednesday. He said if it's there on Saturday it's evaluated for adoption on Monday.

Ms. Garrambone asked would it be there the next Saturday.

Mr. Woodward said it could be.

Ms. Garrambone said we're talking about people gainfully employed and working and available to come in to adopt an animal assuming Monday to Friday is off the table and Saturday is their available day to adopt. She said if it comes in on a Monday, Rover comes in on Monday, he is not up for adoption, nobody claims him not that Saturday and he's not euthanized because he's in good shape there's nothing wrong with Rover he's got no heartworms or nothing.

Mr. Woodward said the following Monday we're going to evaluate to see if he's good and he'll go up for adoption that day.

Ms. Garrambone asked is he still there the next Saturday.

Numerous Board members replied not if the dog was adopted before then.

Mr. Woodward said he did not have a limited amount of time that he holds them in adoption if he has the room.

Ms. Garrambone said that's what she's trying to find out if he has the opportunity to be around for the people that may want to but can't come by during the week.

Ms. Nagan asked if there was a five day hold though either by county or state law because she read it somewhere.

Mr. Woodward said there was nothing in state statutes. He said if she read it somewhere let him know (inaudible).

Ms. Nagan said not owned stray animals (sic). She said she would see if she could find it and bring it next time.

Ms. Garrambone asked there's a certain amount of days that you hold them to give people a chance when Ms. Nagan spoke over her saying not always.

Ms. Wittmer said let's move on, if we want to talk about this let's talk about it at the next meeting.

Ms. Garrambone said this is something the Board has to do too because now the Board found out anything they want to talk about they gotta kinda bring it up here.

Ms. Wittmer spoke to Ms. Colby asking it doesn't have to be an agenda item for us to talk about it at the next meeting is that correct.

Ms. Colby said or you can put it on the agenda, either way.

Ms. Garrambone said this is the other thing she was always under the impression you're supposed to put stuff on the agenda so the public is informed.

Ms. Colby said formal topics that the Board is planning on spending time on if you know what they are you should put them on the agenda. She said there are obviously things that come up that you don't necessarily when Ms. Garrambone spoke over saying her things that the public comes back and says "Oh! I didn't know you were going to discuss that you know I would have been at your meeting if I knew you were going to discuss that."

Ms. Wittmer asked Ms. Garrambone if she wanted to put it on the agenda, yes or no.

Ms. Garrambone replied she was alright with knowing that if they're open Saturdays there's the opportunity.

Ms. Wittmer so we are not putting it on the agenda.

Ms. Wittmer said moving on to reports did anyone have any questions about the reports, the hour is late and she didn't think it is necessary to go through every single report.

Ms. Colby asked to report on something. She said Central Florida Pug rescue closed two puppy mills last month.

Ms. Garrambone spoke directly to Mr. Woodward asking if he ever heard anything about the one speaker that said there's that one (puppy mill) in Geneva.

Mr. Woodward said it did go in front of the code enforcement board and they said what they could not do was to continue to sell puppies from that property. He said if they want to continue to breed them they can do that because they are their pets. He said once they start selling them, they have the public coming out to the property or they open up an internet site to sell them then at that point they would be cited for however many days. He said there is no license, that was just what the code enforcement board put in place because they were operating a business without a business license.

Ms. Nagan asked to change that law you have to go through the state for that agricultural law.

Mr. Woodward replied that is on the state level.

Ms. Wittmer asked if the commission approved Chapter 20.

Mr. Woodward replied that he did not want to go on the record to say a definitive date but we are pushing for late July, August timeframe to possibly take something to the Board. He said if Tad (Stone) decides to take it at that time and if the Board wishes to hear it at that time. He said there are a lot of if's (sic).

- A. Transport Statistics.
- B. Euthanasia Statistics.
- C. Customer Contact Statistics.
- D. Pet Data, Inc. Statistics.

VIII. Confirmation of Next Meeting.

Ms. Wittmer announced she has a conflict on the eighth (of September) and the Clerk said the Board can have the room on the fifteenth (of September). She asked if anybody has a problem with moving from the eighth to the fifteenth so she could attend the September meeting.

There was a consensus and Ms. Wittmer said go ahead and set the meeting for the fifteenth of September.

- September 8, 2011 or September 15, 2011
- December 8, 2011
- March 8, 2012

IX. Adjournment.

Ms. Wittmer called for a motion to adjourn.

Motion by Dr. Vaughan to adjourn the meeting at 9:49 PM. Second by Ms. Prince. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,