

# OFFICIAL

**SEMINOLE COUNTY  
ANIMAL CONTROL BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**

**December 9, 2010  
7:00 PM**

- MEMBERS PRESENT:** Gail Nagan  
Marylin Wittmer, Vice Chairman  
Kathleen Prince  
Dr. Joe Vaughan, Chairman  
Keith Weissman
- MEMBERS ABSENT:** Debra Garrambone  
Gayle Hair
- 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 December 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 7:00 PM.

II. Roll Call.

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

III. Minutes: September 9, 2010.

Motion by Ms. Wittmer to approve the minutes.

Ms. Nagan said there were typos in the minutes and she tried to get them changed before the meeting to save time and she was going to let it go this time.

Second by Ms. Prince. Motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Vaughan announced Ann Colby, Assistant County Attorney, asked to speak to the Board.

Ms. Colby said she was speaking at the request of the Chairman of the Board of County Commissioners. The Chairman directed Ms. Colby to provide

the Animal Control Board (Board) members with a copy of Section 20.05 of the Seminole County Code, which speaks to the functions of the Board, and to review this section with the Board. Ms. Colby proceeded with the review then called for questions relative to the Animal Control Board's duties and responsibilities.

Ms. Wittmer asked if this language was new.

Ms. Colby said the language was current. She said relative to the ordinance revisions the Board of County Commissioners had not suggested to the County Attorney's Office that they wanted to expand or contract the Board's responsibilities.

Ms. Colby said the Director of Public Safety asked the County Attorney's Office to prepare an ordinance dealing with fixed point restraining devices to be added to Chapter 20 of the Seminole County Code. The County Attorney's Office prepared the ordinance pursuant to the code revisions discussed by the Animal Control Board. She said the ordinance document will be scheduled after the first of the year for an agenda before the Board of County Commissioners. Ms. Colby said at that meeting the Board of County Commissioners will set a public hearing date on the ordinance and the public hearing date will be advertised and the matter will again go before the Board of County Commissioners for their action. Ms. Colby said the rest of the revised ordinance was still pending and will be taken to the Board of County Commissioners as one ordinance.

Ms. Wittmer asked if that was the section discussed several months ago.

Ms. Colby said yes. She said it was the version that came before the Board and was approved by the Board for recommendation to the Director of Public Safety.

Morgan Woodward, Animal Services Manager, said the Board only discussed that section and did not vote on it.

Ms. Colby said she understood the Board discussed that section and that was the section that was requested.

#### IV. Public Commentary.

Dr. Vaughan announced the Board would take public commentary and called for speaker request forms.

Carla Wilson, 702 Heather Lane, Winter Springs, addressed the Board on the subject of anti-chaining.

Ms. Wilson asked the Board how this ordinance (supra) will help dogs like a dog named Mimi who is chained near Hendrix Antiques in Oviedo. She asked when the ordinance will be presented to the Board of County Commissioners.

Ms. Wilson said she talked with Mr. Woodward about Mimi in Oviedo who is chained twenty four seven. She said she was wondering how this was going to help her.

Dr. Vaughan reminded Ms. Wilson this portion of the meeting was for public commentary and not for the Board to answer questions. He said the ordinance will go before the Board of County Commissioners and there was no way for the Board to answer her question. He said the Board was not here to answer her question.

Ms. Colby asked Dr. Vaughan if she might respond to Ms. Wilson. Ms. Colby said once the fixed restraining device ordinance has been enacted Animal Services will respond to complaints relative to the ordinance, and a violation will result in the issuance of a citation and the usual citation process will ensue.

Ms. Wilson said the ordinance specifies temperatures higher than ninety degrees and lower than thirty two. She asked if Mimi could be out when the temperature was thirty five degrees at night.

Ms. Colby replied she did not recall the exact temperature parameters listed in the ordinance agenda document.

Ms. Nagan said she wanted to make a motion to add something to the ordinance.

Dr. Vaughan said the meeting was in public hearing (sic) and this was not the time for that.

Ms. Colby said that at this point in the process any such recommendations must be made directly to the Board of County Commissioners.

Ms. Nagan said she wanted to clarify something. She said that things were said at other meetings and she wanted to make sure all were on the same page.

Ms. Nagan said the reason she was told by every Commissioner several times as well as other people the reason we're doing this isn't to come to an agreement with staff it's that they want to know both opinions (sic). She said if the Board has a different opinion on something that was OK and we do not have to agree.

Dr. Vaughan said the Board does not have to be unanimous.

Ms. Nagan said no she was saying the Board could be unanimous disagreeing having a different opinion and both ideas will be presented will get presented to the Commissioners because that was what they asked for (sic).

Ms. Colby said she was asked for the version of the ordinance the Director of Public Safety submitted.

Ms. Nagan said she was talking about everything in general and not just that.

Dr. Vaughan called for the next speaker.

Jeanie Ahern, 1705 Retreat Road, Geneva, addressed the Board on the subject of a puppy mill at 1801 Retreat Road, Geneva.

Ms. Ahern said the property owners at this address applied for a commercial kennel license but withdrew their application. She said the property owners sell animals online and have over a hundred dogs on the property. Ms. Ahern asked what could be done about this.

Ms. Prince asked if complaints had been made.

Mr. Woodward said the Seminole County Code Enforcement Office (SCCEO) investigated complaints relative to this property. He said SCCEO determined the property owners use two web sites to offer animals for sale and are operating a business on property zoned as residential. Mr. Woodward said SCCEO has required the property owners to secure a commercial kennel license, and failure to do so will result in the business being shut down.

Ms. Ahern then spoke about the property owners' history with Brevard County relative to selling dogs.

Ms. Ahern said she wants the County to establish limits on the number of dogs that can be on a property (sic) to discourage backyard breeders and animal hoarders.

Dr. Vaughan called for the next speaker.

Phyllis Ayoob, 572 Seminole Woods Boulevard, Geneva, did not identify any subject(s) on the speaker request form. She read the following verbatim statement. "Last year Seminole County Animal Services killed over forty nine hundred animals. Now some ordinances are being proposed that will be mostly counterproductive saving lives such as leash laws for cats and high fines and court actions for those trying to reclaim a lost pet. These types of ordinances will

only result in more animals being turned in to animal control and more animals being killed.”

Ms. Ayoob said she had questions that she will take to the Commissioners. She read the following verbatim questions. “How is animal control going to reform to reduce the number of animals killed this year? Is animal services open to joining the no kill animal nation equation that is being embraced by cities and counties across the country and which of you are willing to learn more about the new no kill nation movement? Anybody?”

Ms. Nagan responded that she was.

Ms. Nagan then directed her own verbatim question to the Board, asking “Anyone else?” Ms. Nagan directed another question to the Board, asking if anyone else wanted to learn about progressive movements.

Dr. Vaughan said information can be found on the web.

Dr. Vaughan called for the next speaker.

Maria Bolton-Joubert, 1128 Covington Street, Oviedo, addressed the Board on the subjects of wanting to know fees involved with putting down a dog and/or cat, how much and a monetary (tax dollar) question.

Ms. Bolton-Joubert said she wanted to know where to get information about the cost in tax dollars to euthanize a dog or a cat. She said she wanted to know the cost per animal and not a lump sum amount.

Ms. Nagan said counties around here all say approximately one twenty five (sic).

Ms. Colby advised Ms. Bolton-Joubert to make a public records request for this information.

Dr. Vaughan said there were fixed costs.

Ms. Bolton-Joubert said she was enraged that businesses are allowed to sell cats and dogs while tax dollars are used to euthanize animals.

Dr. Vaughan called for the next speaker.

Lisa Reddy, 699 Green Turtle Court, Geneva, addressed the Board about the spay/neuter rebate program.

Ms. Reddy said this program was discontinued in October 2008 but the program remains part of the county code. Ms. Reddy wanted to know why

rebates were no longer given. She said rebates encourage spay/neuter. She said rebates were important to rescues doing a job animal control should be doing.

Mr. Woodward said the program funding was cut.

Ms. Colby said the Board of County Commissioners directs funding cuts.

Ms. Nagan said she believed the money was transferred to the SPCA for the contract. She said there was a consent agenda item and the rebate money was given to the SPCA instead for the mobile unit. She said it was not cut it was transferred.

Ms. Reddy resumed speaking and Ms. Nagan continued speaking. Their remarks were disjointed.

Ms. Nagan said the rebate program was never discussed at a Board meeting and was never voted on by the Commissioners. She was also wondering why it was stopped.

Ms. Colby said the Board of County Commissioners vote on a line item budget. She said the Commissioners tell departments where they want cuts made, what programs they want cut and where they want money moved to. She said the Commissioners pass a general budget resolution and if the Commissioners move money then programs are no longer funded.

Ms. Reddy said she understood they said (sic) certain people abused the program and that was why the program was discontinued. She said it did not matter if a rescue group was fixing animals and receiving rebate money. Ms. Reddy said animals were being fixed and reducing the number of animals brought into animal control that all taxpayers pay to euthanize.

Ms. Reddy said she has an appointment on the fourth with Commissioner Horan to discuss this with him.

Dr. Vaughan called for the next speaker.

Maggie Rosinia, 1221 Enderby Court, Chuluota, addressed the Board about anti-tethering.

Ms. Rosinia said Orange County has had anti-tethering since 2005. She said she did not understand why it was taking so long in Seminole County. She said chained animals bite, become unsocialized and become crazed. Ms. Rosinia again said she did not understand why this ordinance was taking so long. She said this was a no-brainer and was done all over the United States. She

said Seminole County was probably twenty five years behind the curve. She wanted anybody to answer the question about why it's taken so long.

Mr. Woodward said approximately two years ago he began writing a revision of the entire animal ordinance. He said presently the Board was reviewing this document a few sections at the time. He said discussion and review focused on a few sections at the time allows the Board to thoroughly question and understand the revisions.

Ms. Rosinia said she could not agree with that.

Ms. Nagan said Carla Wilson presented it four years ago.

Ms. Rosinia said to copy it. She said it was done all over the United States. She said to go online and copy Orange County's ordinance and revise it if it was wrong. She said it was just not that hard to do.

Ms. Colby began to explain that only the Board of County Commissioners has the legislative authority to enact laws.

Ms. Rosinia spoke over Ms. Colby asking if the Animal Control Board makes recommendations.

Ms. Colby said the Board can and does make recommendations.

Ms. Rosinia asked if they just blow you off.

Ms. Colby resumed her explanation, saying if the Board of County Commissioners wants to legislate something they direct the County Attorney's office to see to it.

Ms. Rosinia asked if the County Commissioners have to ask you guys (sic) to have an anti-tethering ordinance.

Ms. Colby said the County Attorney takes direction from either the Commissioners or the County Manager.

Ms. Rosinia asked you don't initiate it.

Ms. Colby said no.

Ms. Nagan said citizens initiate it. She said Carla Wilson initiated it in 2007 and she was told to bring it to animal control.

Ms. Wittmer asked to speak. She said Mr. Woodward is the Manager at Animal Services. She said she did not know if any present knew how many

hours and how much work was involved in that job. She said Animal Services has wanted to revise the ordinance that controls the animals in Seminole County. Ms. Wittmer said Mr. Woodward took each section and worked with Ms. Colby who is the County Attorney (sic) to try and get the wording exactly right. She said when dealing with laws you have to have the wording exactly right. Ms. Wittmer said it takes a long time. She said the Board was an advisory board and that's all the Board can do. She said the Board can only advise the Public Safety Director on recommendations they would like. She said they've already taken the initiative to rewrite the ordinance and they've already rewritten the ordinance. Ms. Wittmer said Ms. Colby just said she sent it to the County Commissioners. Ms. Wittmer said all of this was moot.

Ms. Rosinia said it was not moot.

Dr. Vaughan gaveled the meeting to restore order.

Dr. Vaughan called for the next speaker.

There were no more speaker request forms. Dr. Vaughan closed public commentary.

Ms. Prince asked to speak and to make a comment to the audience. She issued an invitation to volunteer at animal control at the shelter. Her invitation was answered with a loud, negative outcry from the audience.

Ms. Prince said before you slam how everything is done go and see how it works day to day (sic).

The loud, negative outcry from the audience continued.

Ms. Prince said it is a government related shelter that does great work (sic).

Over the outcry Ms. Nagan said it was a matter of being progressive or backwards and they want to be progressive.

Ms. Prince said she was just throwing out the invitation to become volunteers.

The loud, negative outcry from the audience continued.

Ms. Nagan spoke directly to Ms. Prince saying they do more than anybody at animal control does and she, meaning Ms. Prince, did not know what these people do. Ms. Nagan continued saying they already do a lot and repeated that it was a matter of being progressive or staying backwards and that was what they are talking about.

Dr. Vaughan gaveled the meeting to quiet the audience and restore order.

Ms. Nagan said counties all around Seminole County have already done this.

V. Old Business.

A. Review Proposed Seminole County Animal Ordinance.

1. Sections 20.38 through 20.44; Sections 20.60 through 20.62; Sections 20.70 through 20.76 (initially reviewed on 9/9/10).
2. Rewrite of Section 20.30(b) [livestock shelter] (initially reviewed 7/20/10)

Dr. Vaughan called for discussion.

Ms. Nagan asked if the guard dogs were part of that. Ms. Nagan said the last time the Board spoke about guard dogs she mentioned thirty minutes on a leash and fifteen off a leash per day was too little. She said other people responded that guard dogs were loose all the time but this ordinance was specific for dogs that were confined.

Dr. Vaughan asked Ms. Nagan which ordinance number she was referring to. Ms. Nagan replied 20.40 Requirements of Guard Dog Users. She said there was a typo on the agenda.

Ms. Nagan said this particular code 20.40, and then read verbatim "If a guard dog is confined to an area which does not allow for sufficient exercise, the guard dog shall be provided with minimum daily exercise consisting of either thirty minutes of leashed activity or fifteen minutes of free activity ..."

Ms. Nagan said it was not talking about most guard dogs that were free. She said it was talking about a confined dog that gets insufficient exercise. Ms. Nagan said she called several vets and they were all afraid to give their name for some reason. She said they were afraid of animal control and she did not know why. She said they all agreed it was too little. She said she called the guard dog company<sup>1</sup> and he said at a minimum that it should be twice a day, forty minute brisk walks. Ms. Nagan said she also called the certified dog listener (sic)<sup>2</sup> who was a behavioral specialist. She said they all think this was way too little for the mental health of the dog as well as the physical health.

Dr. Vaughan said that was just the minimum.

---

<sup>1</sup> Ms. Nagan did not identify the guard dog company or the person at the guard dog company to whom she spoke.

<sup>2</sup> Ms. Nagan did not identify the certified dog listener to whom she spoke.

Ms. Nagan said it was just way too little for a dog that was confined all day.

Dr. Vaughan asked if she wanted to make it forty minutes twice a day. He asked what if you have a ten or twelve year old dog with a heart condition.

Ms. Nagan said the section ends with unless the veterinarian issues a written medical exception.

Dr. Vaughan asked so they have to get a medical exception.

Ms. Nagan said otherwise we were going to have dogs confined all day except for fifteen minutes every twenty four hours. She asked why it could not be doubled.

Dr. Vaughan asked if she wanted to make it forty minutes and how will it be regulated.

Ms. Nagan asked how was anything going to be regulated. She said at least it will be on the books. She said you can't regulate what you have now either. She said it makes animals aggressive. She said fifteen minutes was very little. She said she called K9 officers but their dogs get a lot of activity so she couldn't compare it.

Dr. Vaughan called for comments.

Ms. Nagan asked where did the thirty minutes on a leash and fifteen minutes off a leash come from. She asked if it was recommended.

Dr. Vaughan said he did not know.

Motion by Ms. Nagan that guard dogs confined all day without sufficient exercise should twice a day go on a brisk walk for a minimum of forty minutes.

Ms. Wittmer asked to speak in order to ask a question. Ms. Wittmer asked if it was appropriate for Ms. Nagan to make a motion.

Ms. Colby began to respond by saying Ms. Nagan was developing a consensus relative to this code revision.

Ms. Nagan spoke over Ms. Colby. Their remarks were disjointed.

Dr. Vaughan said he was going to poll the board members. He asked if any Board members had any trouble with the revision as presented. All were in agreement except Ms. Nagan.

Ms. Nagan said apparently it does not get on record if she does not make it a motion so she wanted to make it a motion unless it's (inaudible) on record.

Dr. Vaughan said he had no trouble one way or the other with it. He said eighty minutes a day seemed a lot.

Ms. Nagan asked how about half an hour twice a day.

Ms. Nagan said to Mr. Weissman he had a K9 dog. She asked if he thought fifteen minutes a day was too little for a dog.

Dr. Vaughan resumed speaking and Ms. Nagan continued speaking. Their remarks were disjointed.

Mr. Weissman said he would have to look at what was recommended and look into it more. Ms. Nagan said to Mr. Weissman that they were recommending fifteen minutes free exercise and thirty minutes on a leash in twenty four hours.

Ms. Nagan asked if this discussion was going to be in the minutes.

Dr. Vaughan said the discussion was being recorded.

Ms. Nagan said she would like for it to be in the minutes. She said it could be summarized. She said it did not have to be detailed. She said like it used to be.

Dr. Vaughan called for a second on the motion. The motion failed for lack of a second.

Dr. Vaughan called for additional discussion relative to old business.

Ms. Wittmer said she wanted to thank all for delaying the discussion on the change she asked for about not having to have an actual structure for wildlife (sic).

Ms. Wittmer said she had a comment on Section 20.41 Artificial Coloring of an Animal is Prohibited. She said she understood what Animal Services was trying to do but it said unlawful to dye or color an animal. She said they have horse paint that sometimes when horses were going for shows they paint the horse. She said during the hurricane they had horse paint where owners wrote their phone number on their horses so if the horses got out there will be a phone number.

Mr. Woodward responded this section was taken from state law.

Ms. Wittmer said she had a comment on Section 20.39 Animal Unattended in a Motor Vehicle. She said she understood but what about K9 officers were they excused from this.

Mr. Woodward said they were exempt.

Ms. Wittmer said what about nice weather. She asked if it would matter if it was fifty degrees outside and the windows were open.

Ms. Colby said neither children nor animals can be left unattended in a vehicle.

Dr. Vaughan said that was state law.

Ms. Wittmer said you can leave the air conditioning on and that was a problem some times.

Mr. Woodward said that would be a DMV (sic) issue where you are not allowed to leave a vehicle running unattended.

Dr. Vaughan called for discussion.

Ms. Nagan said she wanted to know about the leash law for cats. She asked how was that going to affect feral cats. She asked what the purpose of it was.

Mr. Woodward said there was no exception in the revised ordinance for feral cats.

Ms. Nagan asked what did that mean.

Mr. Woodward said all animals in Seminole County need to be restrained by a leash.

Ms. Nagan asked if a feral cat was not on a leash what did that mean. She asked what happens. She asked does it get trapped and put down.

Mr. Woodward said nothing will happen because if you allow your animal to run on your property you have that right. He said if it goes off your property and becomes a nuisance to someone else then the nuisance has to be addressed. Mr. Woodward said if a person wanted to obtain a trap and trap the animal they have every right to do so. He said this was more for the safety of the animal than for anything.

Ms. Nagan said the revised code was changing it to written consent from the property owner instead of expressed or implied consent. She asked if that meant also for people who trap to have animals put down that they also need permission from the property owner, including Animal Services, was it both sides that now need written consent.

Mr. Woodward asked Ms. Nagan to clarify her question.

Ms. Nagan said now if you have a colony (sic) somewhere and the people do not say anything they let you trap and fix and feed that was implied consent and it was OK. She said or if they tell you you can do it that was expressed consent. She said the revised code was changing it that it has to be written consent from the property owner. Ms. Nagan said animal control does not have written consent from the property owner and neither do other people who trap to have the animal put down.

Mr. Woodward said before a person can get a trap they complete a form and the trap issued to them gives Animal Services consent to place the trap on their property.

Ms. Nagan said these people were not property owners who do this but they were people who lived there or worked there.

Mr. Woodward said he was not aware of the situation she was referring to.

Ms. Nagan said any situation. She said it was very rare that it was the property owner.

Mr. Woodward asked Ms. Nagan to bring a situation to his attention and he would address it.

Ms. Nagan said she wanted to make a motion as follows:<sup>3</sup> "Can I make a motion that people that trap and fix cats get their own trap and do it on their own and instead of using tax dollars and animal control time people that want to trap to bring them into animal control should also get their own trap and bring it in themselves to be fair so I'd like to make a motion that we stop lending traps out to people there's no reason for it and that would save a lot of time for the animal control officers to work on like cruelty cases or something else."

Dr. Vaughan called for a second on the motion. The motion failed for lack of a second.

Mr. Weissman made a remark that was inaudible. Ms. Nagan responded to him by asking if he knew about trap/neuter/return for feral cats. Ms. Nagan said traps are leant out for people who want them killed.

---

<sup>3</sup> Ms. Nagan's motion appears verbatim in the minutes due to the motion's length and complexity.

Dr. Vaughan called for additional comments.

Ms. Nagan said the shelter and shade in section 20.30 Cruelty/Neglect/Abandonment did not mention, as in the anti-tethering section, the temperature. She said she wanted to make a motion for the shelter.

Dr. Vaughan said that was being addressed by the county.

Ms. Colby said the anti-tethering section mentions temperature.

Ms. Nagan said in the adequate shelter it did not mention temperature. She said she wanted to add that the temperature was never below thirty degrees or a wind chill of thirty two, never above ninety or a heat index of ninety, but should always be suitable for the species, age, condition, size and type of each companion animal.

Dr. Vaughan asked Ms. Nagan which section she was referring to.

Ms. Nagan said that was exactly what another county has and she thinks it covers everything.

Ms. Wittmer asked if she was talking about livestock.

Ms. Nagan answered no, dogs and cats.

Ms. Wittmer said she did know where Ms. Nagan was.

Ms. Nagan said section 20.30(b).

Dr. Vaughan and Ms. Prince said that was livestock.

Ms. Nagan said no, the section included livestock.

Mr. Woodward said this section was talking about cruelty, neglect and abandonment. He said this was taking some verbiage from the state statute pertaining to the animal cruelty act. He said it did not particularly refer to livestock but included all animals. He said when talking about chaining an animal we were talking about the temperature in which you chain an animal outside. Mr. Woodward said when you talk about temperature limits in the animal cruelty act what's the purpose unless the animals are being chained and that was already addressed. He said if you have them in the backyard they were provided shelter.

Ms. Nagan said it had to be adequate shelter. She said the shelter might not protect them from the cold. She said it had to be insulated or something.

Ms. Wittmer asked if you have cows will you want to invite them in your house.

Ms. Nagan said no but dogs. She said it had to be an insulated shelter and not that they were in an enclosure when it was twenty degrees inside (sic). She said the shelter, the dog house or whatever should be properly insulated so the animals were not freezing or too hot and were comfortable.

Dr. Vaughan asked if wasn't this all state law.

Ms. Nagan said Alachua County and other counties have it and she thought Seminole County could be progressive and add it.

Mr. Woodward said you are required to have shelter to escape from the elements.

Ms. Nagan said but you cannot escape from the elements.

Mr. Woodward said it was the niceties of having it insulated with a light bulb and having lights so they can turn it on to go to the bathroom. He said he knew the ordinance Ms. Nagan was referring to.

Ms. Nagan said she was thinking about dogs like Mimi (supra) who because she has a dog house people think she has proper shelter. She said it could be freezing in the dog house. She said it's a crappy (sic) dog house. She said there was no protection

Mr. Woodward said she was off the ground. He said she can turn around, lie down, curl up and go to sleep.

Ms. Nagan said yes but the temperature will be twenty three degrees next week. She asked do you think it is an insulated dog house and she answered her question by saying no. Ms. Nagan said that was why she was saying it has to be a proper dog house that was at least insulated so she was not freezing. She said she was trying to be progressive here and for some reason nobody else agrees with her. Ms. Nagan said she did not know why. She said she wished she knew but OK as long as she said what she thinks (sic).

Mr. Weissman said a dog house was fine and he agreed with Mr. Woodward that the dog could curl up in there. Ms. Nagan said some of these were handmade, wooden, crappy (sic) things with spaces and holes. Mr. Weissman said at least it was cutting the wind. He said he goes back to animals in the wild that go down in their den. Ms. Nagan said we could be talking old dogs, sickly dogs and that was why she wanted to add depending on the age, species and condition.

Dr. Vaughan said for himself he was a little more Libertarian in that he hated to see the county dictate every little thing and he made a reference to mandatory seat belt laws.

Ms. Nagan said the Board was talking animal cruelty here. She said they should not say we need a license tag or a collar or a leash if you're a cat. She said the Board was talking about things to help the animals versus things that don't help the animals.

Mr. Weissman said if you do too much of it we were going to see more animals in shelters. He said people will get rid of their dogs if you put on too many boundaries.

Ms. Nagan said you cannot have it both ways and that was what it seemed to be here.

Dr. Vaughan said Ms. Nagan reclined (sic) her motion.

Ms. Nagan said she did not rescind her motion.

Dr. Vaughan called for a second on the motion. The motion failed for lack of a second.

## VI. New Business.

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

Dr. Vaughan called for discussion.

Ms. Wittmer said she had a comment on Section 20.50, section d, Procedure for Declaring a Dog Dangerous. Ms. Wittmer said it sounded like the paragraph was saying the owner may keep the animal at their own home. She asked if she was misreading it or was that the way it works. She said she thought it was up to animal control whether or not they keep the animal at home.

Mr. Woodward said Animal Services can make the decision. He said if Animal Services believes the person can keep the animal in a safe and humane environment so this situation cannot happen again, Animal Services will allow them to keep the animal there rather than bringing it into the shelter.

Ms. Wittmer said the way the paragraph reads it made it sound like the owner had that discretion rather than animal control.

Mr. Woodward said he tried to clarify that by saying any dog subject to a dangerous dog investigation which is not impounded at the Animal Services

shelter. He said if Animal Services has not taken custody of the animal then the owner has that ability. He said maybe he should change the verb shall to the verb may.

Ms. Colby said the verb should be shall and explained the difference between the two verbs in this context.

Ms. Wittmer asked by saying which is not impounded at the animal services shelter means that Animal Services has the option of impounding it and it was not up to the owner.

Ms. Colby said Animal Services always makes the decision as to whether or not the animal should be impounded at the shelter.

Dr. Vaughan called for additional discussion.

Mr. Woodward said this section has a lot of language which is a step by step procedure formalized in an ordinance.

Ms. Colby said much of the language was taken from state law. She said the ordinance translates how the state law will be carried out in Seminole County.

Dr. Vaughan called for additional discussion. There was none.

B. Future Agenda Items.

Dr. Vaughan called for future agenda items.

Ms. Nagan asked if she could discuss some of her suggestions about the meetings. She asked if she could make them now.

Ms. Nagan said the Board knows pretty much nine months in advance what the tentative dates are and two to three days notice to get confirmation was very little. She said she was thinking maybe the Board could have more like three to four weeks. She said you know if you have a wedding or vacation.

Ms. Prince said she could not give four weeks.

Dr. Vaughan said he could not.

Ms. Nagan asked other than getting sick what comes up a couple of weeks ahead of time.

Ms. Prince said she works seven days a week depending on her clients.

Ms. Nagan asked so it depends on whom you have that week.

Ms. Prince said it depends on whom she has that day.

Ms. Nagan asked so three days was the best.

Ms. Prince said it was best.

Dr. Vaughan said it was hard for him too.

Ms. Nagan said on the agenda to list the topics so people know what the Board will be speaking about. She said you were only talking about a few words. She said today would have only been dangerous dog. She wanted to suggest listing the topics on the agenda. She said all it says now was animal code ordinance. Ms. Nagan said it was super vague. She said it will be nice if we at least put the topics down on the agenda. She said they used to always have topics. She asked if anyone had a problem with that.

Mr. Woodward said the Board was reviewing the ordinance as a whole.

Ms. Nagan said but we know what sections.

Mr. Woodward said we were not limiting it at least we were trying not to leave everything (sic) off of the table. He said certainly anything was up for discussion because this was the Board's time to review it and bring up questions.

Ms. Nagan said to Mr. Woodward he was misunderstanding her. She said if the Board knew when they got the packet that it was 20.30 you could write on the agenda cruelty, you could write guard dog users, artificial coloring. Ms. Nagan asked what the problem with that was.

Mr. Woodward said here was his thinking on that. He said take the dangerous dog situation where you have got Section 20.50.

Ms. Nagan said you only have to say dangerous dog you do not have to say each topic.

Mr. Woodward said that was eleven pages and we were not just talking about dangerous dogs. He said we were talking about requirements to obtain a valid registration for a dangerous dog.

Ms. Nagan said it was all about a dangerous dog.

Mr. Woodward said we are talking about all the requirements.

Ms. Nagan said she was talking about the main title not the sub-titles.

Mr. Woodward said there was more to it than just that. He said if we were going to review specifically sections 20.50 all the way through to the very end and list every single topic we may not get to it. He said it was on the agenda unless a motion was made to postpone it to the next meeting.

Ms. Nagan said you could just put dangerous dog. She said you do not have to put the sub-topics you could put the main topic.

Ms. Wittmer said when the Board members get the agenda they get all of the information.

Ms. Nagan said the citizens do not when they look on the web site they see nothing.

Mr. Woodward said the backup documentation will be on the web site from now on so the public will have access to everything.

Ms. Nagan asked going back since we started with the ordinance can you put the whole proposed ordinance.

Ms. Colby said the ordinance is online.

Ms. Nagan said not the new one.

Ms. Colby said no, the current ordinance is online.

Ms. Nagan said no, she was talking about this that we review here. She said the citizens would like to be able to look at it.

At this point in the discussion a member of the audience shouted out a question to which Ms. Nagan responded "I'll tell you after the meeting."

Ms. Colby said if anybody wishes to have a copy of any part of the ordinance all they had to do was ask. She said it was public record.

Ms. Nagan said she was told by the Acting County Manager it was going to be put on the web site. She said she wanted to know if it could be put on from the first meeting when the Board discussed it and not just going forward. She said the public should know what the Board discussed.

Ms. Colby said the whole thing will be put on.

Ms. Nagan said for some reason you used to be able to copy and paste. She said since oh nine (sic) it has been on the web site differently where you get an X cross where you cannot copy and paste anymore. She asked if there was a way it could be put on like it used to be.

Mr. Woodward said that was an IT issue.

Ms. Nagan said everyone else was done the old way except for the committee on aging and animal control. She said for some reason that the minutes you cannot cut and paste any more

A member of the audience shouted out a remark to which Ms. Nagan responded she would ask SGTV.

Ms. Colby said any county document that is sent out goes as a PDF so it cannot be altered.

Ms. Nagan said she can copy and paste the Commissioner's meetings and everyone else's meetings. She said she cannot change it but she can copy and paste even the County Commissioner's minutes.

Dr. Vaughan asked if there was anything else to discuss under future agenda items. There was none.

## VII. Reports.

### A. Transport Statistics.

Dr. Vaughan called for discussion. There was none.

### B. Euthanasia Statistics.

Dr. Vaughan called for discussion.

Ms. Nagan said she had a few suggestions. She said for one thing the categories here most people do not know what they mean. She said she would like to request to have a keynote chart on the bottom that explains what each abbreviation is. She said like B E H manage. She said people just do not know what that is including County Commissioners. She asked if everyone agreed with her. She said it was no big deal to have just on the bottom an explanation of what it means, what the abbreviations mean.

Ms. Prince said it was pretty simple to read what they are.

Ms. Nagan said the County Commissioners could not understand it.

Ms. Nagan directed a question to Mr. Weissman saying "I bet you don't even know. What's B E H severe?"

Ms. Nagan asked if anyone knew what B E H severe was.

Dr. Vaughan answered it meant behavior management.

Ms. Nagan said most people do not know what it means including County Commissioners, including the deputy sheriff over here. She said she did not know the big deal just to write it on the bottom.

Dr. Vaughan asked Mr. Woodward if the abbreviations were due to the fields allowing so many characters.

Mr. Woodward said that was the way Crystal Reports pulls the information from Animal Services reporting program, out of Chameleon.

Ms. Nagan said it was supposed to be community friendly.

Mr. Woodward said this report came directly out of the software that Animal Services uses for reporting and these are the abbreviations it uses.

Ms. Nagan said Chameleon was not as good as it was cracked up to be. She said we switched from it so it would be better. She asked so there was no way to do that with Chameleon.

Dr. Vaughan said there was probably no way to do that without re-programming the software.

Mr. Woodward said he would be more than happy to spell it out.

Ms. Wittmer said if somebody wanted to know they can call and ask.

Ms. Nagan asked why should they have to. She said it should be community friendly like it used to be.

A member of the audience shouted out to the Board.

Ms. Nagan said we are supposed to be an advisory board for the citizens as well. She said we each represent the citizens so she did not understand what the problem was.

Ms. Wittmer said the thing was this is county government and every time you ask Mr. Woodward to do something else it costs more money.

Ms. Nagan spoke directly to Ms. Wittmer saying almost every single progressive thing at animal control was because of citizens going to the Commissioners.

Dr. Vaughan gaveled the meeting to quiet the audience and restore order.

Dr. Vaughan said Mr. Woodward already said he was going to write it in.

Ms. Nagan said she was answering Ms. Wittmer's statement.

Someone from the audience shouted out to Mr. Woodward, calling him by his first name.

Dr. Vaughan reminded the audience that public commentary was over.

Ms. Nagan said directly to Dr. Vaughan that at the last meeting he mentioned how progressive animal control was that now they spay and neuter the animals. She said that was because citizens went to the Commissioners and they brought it back to the Board and then it went back to them. She asked why do they have volunteers and answered her own question by saying they never (sic) had a volunteer because of citizens going to the Commissioners bringing it back to the Board. She said the same thing here. She said people go to the Commissioners they bring it to animal control to bring it back to the Board. She said the Commissioners want our opinion as well as the government's opinion. She said they want to know if we think this and Morgan and Ann think this they want to know both opinions so they can decide. Ms Nagan said we are here for law (sic). She said we're going over the ordinance. She said we were here to give our opinion on what the law should be. She said she did not know what the problem was.

Dr. Vaughan said there was not a problem.

Ms. Nagan said she did not know why we cannot be more community friendly since they are the ones that are helping the animals.

Ms. Nagan said she had two more things. She said on the wall in animal control every month they have statistics on intake on how many were claimed, adopted, euthanized. She said she would like to make a motion to add that to the Board's statistics as well. She said it was very easy to read that way. She said that way you have a better idea of what was going on. Ms. Nagan said it will say five hundred dogs came in, a hundred were reclaimed by their owner, a hundred were adopted and three hundred were put down and then for cats. She said she wanted it monthly and the total just like we have for how many we transported to spay neuter and all that stuff.

Dr. Vaughan asked if that was a problem and Ms. Colby replied no.

Ms. Nagan said that was what citizens always want.

Dr. Vaughan asked if anyone had a problem with that. No comments were made. However, the other Board members gave their non-verbal agreement.

Dr. Vaughan asked Ms. Nagan if there was anything else she wanted.

Ms. Nagan said nobody responded last time. She said she would like to make a motion that the Board needs to have statistics.

Dr. Vaughan interrupted and apologized to Ms. Nagan. He said she made a motion on the first one about changing the reports and he called for a second.

Ms. Colby said a motion was not necessary because Ms. Nagan made a suggestion and Mr. Woodward agreed to her suggestion.

Ms. Nagan made a motion that we need to have more detailed statistics on where animals were coming from and why when they were brought into animal control. She said we have the same people bringing in kittens or puppies over and over, the same businesses having them trapped over and over.

Dr. Vaughan asked Ms. Nagan if she worried that if you give up a baby at a fire station and they want to get your name and number then maybe you were going to kick the baby out in the cold.

Ms. Nagan said maybe if they give a hard time but at least start off with the ones that agree. She said there were people who could help them.

Ms. Nagan said a lot of people in rescue go to people's homes and fix their dogs and cats because they do not know to or cannot afford to. She said people in rescue are willing to go to their homes, fix all their animals, take the kittens and puppies, get them homes. She said this way they do not go to animal control anymore.

Ms. Nagan said the same thing with businesses. She said if there were colonies (sic) behind businesses there were people with money and time to get them all.

Dr. Vaughan asked Mr. Woodward what Animal Services does when someone surrenders an animal.

Ms. Nagan said we do not have any statistics on where they are coming from.

Mr. Woodward said we take their name.

Ms. Nagan said location.

Mr. Woodward said yes. He said the problem was with the information Ms. Nagan was requesting and how do we take the information out of our system. He said for example finding out how many cats were brought in off a particular street. He said he does not have a report he can write to pull that information out.

Ms. Nagan said she did not know Chameleon but when she worked in the caregiver industry she said she could plug in an address and it would put everything in alphabetical order.

Mr. Woodward said if Ms. Nagan can give him an address he can tell how many animals were brought in from that particular address. He said he does not have a way to search an area to find the areas where animals are coming from. He said he cannot write those reports. He said he cannot extract that data.

Ms. Nagan said she will find out how they did it at the caregiver company. She said you could click on anything and it would put it alphabetically name, first name, last name, phone number, zip code.

Dr. Vaughan asked if there was a legal part as to giving out that information.

Ms. Colby said it was public record. Ms. Colby said a person could go through the handwritten records and compile it. She said she understood what Mr. Woodward was saying, that the software did not compile it in that manner.

Ms. Nagan said we have to do something to change or it was never going to stop.

Mr. Woodward said with a particular address he can tell what came in from that address. He said he cannot generate random reports that say what area of Seminole County we were getting mostly brown pit bulls from. He said he does not have any way of compiling that data for Ms. Nagan.

Ms. Colby said there may be some software that does that but Animal Services does not have it.

Ms. Nagan said the software where she worked was excellent.

Dr. Vaughan called for more discussion. There was none.

Dr. Vaughan called for a second on the motion. There was none. The motion died for lack of a second.

Dr. Vaughan said it was a good idea but if they cannot do it, they cannot do it.

C. Customer Contact Statistics.

Dr. Vaughan called for discussion. There was none.

D. Pet Data, Inc. Statistics.

Dr. Vaughan called for discussion. There was none.

VIII. Confirmation of Next Meeting.

- March 10, 2011
- June 9, 2011
- September 8, 2011

Dr. Vaughan reviewed the meeting dates.

IX. Adjournment.

Motion by Ms. Wittmer to adjourn the meeting at 8:10 PM. Second by Ms. Prince. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Clerk to the Board