

OFFICIAL

SEMINOLE COUNTY ANIMAL CONTROL BOARD REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

September 9, 2010
7:00 PM

MEMBERS PRESENT: Gail Nagan
Kathleen Prince
Gayle Hair
Dr. Joe Vaughan, Chairman

MEMBERS ABSENT: Marilyn Wittmer, Vice Chairman
Debra Garrambone
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 meeting held September 9, 2010, at 7:00 PM, at the Sheriff's Office/Public Safety Building, 150 Bush Boulevard, Sanford, Florida.

I. Call to Order.

Dr. Vaughan called the meeting to order at 7:05 PM.

II. Roll Call.

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

III. Minutes: July 20, 2010.

Ms. Nagan said the minutes failed to include some things she mentioned at the meeting.

Motion by Dr. Vaughan to approve the minutes, and per Ms. Nagan's request, with the corrections prepared by Ms. Nagan added as an addendum to the minutes to thereby include her remarks that were neither taken up by nor voted upon by the Board. Second by Ms. Prince. Motion passed unanimously.

IV. Public Commentary.

No speaker forms were submitted to the Clerk.

V. Old Business.

A. Review Proposed Seminole County Animal Ordinance.

1. Section 20.19 through 20.18 and Section 20.36 (initially reviewed on 7/20/10).

Morgan Woodward, Animal Services Manager, introduced himself to the Board and asked if there were any questions relative to item one.

Ms. Nagan said she previously stated 30 degrees can be cold and 90 degrees can be hot depending on the animal, and the Alachua County code has what she suggested. She distributed a page from the Alachua County code addressing her suggestion. Dr. Vaughan asked for the Seminole County code sites and she replied 20.30 (sic) about the weather and 20.37 about the fixed point restraining device because it also deals with weather. Ms. Nagan said the Alachua County code is more detailed relative to adequate food, water, shelter and space, and speaks to species, age, condition, size and type of companion animal and does not list each breed, and that is what she was trying to say at the last meeting, to have a flat 32 degrees to (inaudible on the recording) degrees. She said the Alachua County code has more detail which she thinks is good.

Mr. Woodward asked the Board if they had any questions relative to Sections 20.19 through 20.36.

Ms. Nagan said the fixed restraining device is where weather is mentioned.

Mr. Woodward again called for questions relative to Sections 20.19 through 20.36. There were none.

The Board took no action on Ms. Nagan's recommendations.

2. Rewrite of Section 20.30(b) [livestock shelter].

Mr. Woodward suggested carrying forward the rewrite of Section 20.30(b) to the next meeting considering Ms. Wittmer's absence at this meeting and her concerns about this section.

Motion by Dr. Vaughan to table this item until Ms. Wittmer is available. Second by Ms. Prince. Motion passed unanimously.

VI. New Business.

A. Review Revised Seminole County Code, Chapter 20, Animal Ordinance.

Mr. Woodward said there was a lot of material for the Board to review at this meeting, and he advised the language in Section 20.60 relative to quarantining animals was taken almost in its entirety from the rabies compendium issued by the Florida Department of Health.

The Board commenced their review and discussion.

Relative to Section 20.38 Transporting Animals, Ms. Prince inquired if a wire crate would be sufficient. Mr. Woodward responded affirmatively because such a crate would prevent an animal from being ejected out of the crate. She asked if rolled up windows would be sufficient and Mr. Woodward responded affirmatively.

Ms. Nagan raised an issue relative to Section 20.39 Animals Unattended in a Motor Vehicle and who can remove an animal from a vehicle. She asked if a regular person could remove an animal from a vehicle and not be held liable. Mr. Woodward responded the public can assume that risk if they choose to do so. Ms. Colby added that Good Samaritan laws do not apply to animals.

Speaking to Section 20.39 Animals Unattended in a Motor Vehicle, Ms. Prince asked for clarification about leaving an animal unattended in a vehicle even for a short period of time. Mr. Woodward responded an unattended vehicle is an inappropriate enclosure for an animal, and each reported violation would be addressed on a case by case basis.

Regarding Section 20.40 Requirements of Guard Dog Users, Ms. Nagan said the required daily exercise time was too little. She made a suggestion as to how much time would be sufficient but her remarks were inaudible on the recording. Ms. Hair said she too initially thought the time was insufficient except that guard dogs are not kept in cages. Ms. Nagan said people use guard dogs to guard their homes (remainder of her remarks were audible on the recording). Dr. Vaughan said medically thirty minutes a day is sufficient exercise. Ms. Nagan took issue with guard dogs being in a secure enclosure with only room to turn around, and that the code did not specify enclosure size. She remarked about a dog being kept in a yard in a cage. There followed discussion about where guard dogs are used and if caged dogs are really guarding.

Ms. Nagan raised an issue relative to Section 20.44 Animals Exempt from This Chapter relative to Greyhounds at tracks being exempt. Mr. Woodward responded the State has jurisdiction over greyhound racing. Ms. Nagan said she was concerned about selling for experimentation (sic). She asked if the county can tell the state we don't want greyhound racing here. Mr. Woodward responded no. Ms. Hair inquired about Animal Services jurisdiction over transitory circus animals being cruelty treated while in Seminole County, and if hunting dogs are exempt because they are running at large. Mr. Woodward

responded that during a hunt the dogs are not under direct control because they are running free when on a hunt. Ms. Colby reminded the board Section 20.44(a) (as discussed here) speaks only to licensing provisions. Ms. Colby advised Mr. Woodward has the authority to investigate animal cruelty or mistreatment relative to circus animals.

Ms. Nagan raised a question relative to Section 20.70(a) Vaccination Required. Her question was inaudible on the recording. However, Mr. Woodward did respond to her question by saying the rabies vaccination cycle has to start at some point regardless whether the initial vaccination is a one year or three year vaccination, and the state recognizes the initial vaccination as a one year vaccination. After the initial vaccination the state recognizes subsequent boosters whether a one year or a three year booster.

Relative to Section 20.71 Seminole County Pet License Required, Ms. Hair inquired if horses should be required to have a pet license. Mr. Woodward responded it would be feasible to consider only if the state required horses to be vaccinated against rabies. Ms. Hair said her thought was to identify a revenue source to offset expenditures to conduct cruelty investigations involving horses.

Ms. Nagan raised an issue relative Section 20.71 Seminole County Pet License Required. She said most cats can't wear a license because they can't wear a collar and if not a stretchy (sic) they can choke and if it is a stretchy (sic) they can't keep it on and the cats she knows go through collars. Ms. Nagan said in her opinion having a rabies certificate is better than having the license but not practical for cats and most of the cats she knows won't wear collars and won't keep them on. She said especially for people who let their cats outside and the cat gets caught on a fence. Ms. Nagan asked if there would be a fine if the owner has the tag but the cat is not wearing it. Mr. Woodward responded probably not, but the code as presented would give him the authority to do so.

B. Future Agenda Items:

Mr. Woodward called for future agenda items.

Ms. Nagan referred to the Alachua County code she distributed earlier, and said she wanted to add to the revised code sections d, e and f which read as follows.

(d) An owner shall use a collar or harness which is appropriate for the age and size of a companion animal.

(e) A person shall not crop the ears or dock the tail of any dog, unless the person employs a veterinarian to perform the cropping and docking. If a person possesses a dog with an ear or ears cut off or cropped, or tail docked, and with the unhealed wound, then that possession is prima facie evidence of a violation of this section, unless the cropping or docking was performed by a veterinarian.

(f) *A person shall not castrate a companion animal, unless that person employs a veterinarian to perform the castration.*

Ms. Nagan said one (sic) is that a person can't crop the ears or dock the tail unless they are a vet. She said she met a woman from Orange County who told her she did her own dogs and the woman said she is a redneck and so there are people like that. Ms. Nagan said about castrating was there anything in the code that covered that. Mr. Woodward responded that according to state law this would be considered practicing surgery without a license.

Ms. Nagan said she wanted to recommend a wildlife issue. She said she found out last year that some people trap raccoons, etc. and eat them. She said she knows it's illegal to transport wildlife but she found out about someone who did for someone else to have for dinner. She knows these people aren't hungry and she guessed it was an old custom down here for certain people. Ms. Nagan said hunting is one thing but trapping isn't hunting and she heard they drown them and she asked if it is that legal to drown them. There followed a brief discussion about how to kill a trapped animal and about eating wildlife. Ms. Nagan asked if the Board thought this was OK still and the consensus was affirmative.

Mr. Woodward addressed the issue of transporting wildlife because the state law recently changed. Wildlife may be transported either for euthanasia or to property where the property owner is aware the wildlife is being released and has given permission to do so and the property must be larger than ten contiguous acres.

The Board took no action on Ms. Nagan's recommendations.

No future agenda items were suggested other than continued review of the proposed revised ordinance.

VII. Reports.

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

The Board reviewed these reports.

VIII. Confirmation of Next Meeting.

- December 9, 2010
- March 10, 2011
- June 9, 2011

Dr. Vaughan reviewed the meeting dates.

IX. Adjournment.

Motion by Ms. Nagan to adjourn the meeting at 8: 05 PM. Second by Ms. Prince. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Clerk to the Board