

**CITY OF BURLINGTON
PARKS, ARTS & CULTURE COMMITTEE**

**Councilor Joe Magee, Chair, Ward 3
Councilor Ali Dieng, Ward 7
Councilor Mark Barlow, North District**

Staff: Holli Bushnell, Office Assistant
Lakeview Cemetery
hbushnell@burlingtonvt.gov

AGENDA

Parks, Arts and Culture DOG TASK FORCE SUBCOMMITTEE Meeting

Monday, June 26, 2023 5:30pm – 7:00pm

MEETING CONDUCTED VIA ZOOM ONLY

PACC Dog Task Force Meeting

Monday, June 26, 2023

5:30pm – 7pm

VIRTUAL ONLY

Please click the link below to join the webinar:

<https://zoom.us/j/97986555249>

Or One tap mobile :

+19292056099,,96237182773# US (New York)

+13017158592,,96237182773# US (Washington DC)

Or Telephone:

Dial(for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):

+1 929 205 6099 US (New York)

Agenda:

- Public Forum, 5:35pm
- Next Meeting Confirmation
- Review Final Report Timeline
- Sub-Committee Updates
- Continue Ordinance Review

PACC Dog Task Force Meeting

Monday June 26th, 2023 at 5:30pm

In attendance: Maria Karunungan, Lori Kettler, Joanne Kalisz, Nina Hurley, Kyle Tansley, Cindi Wight & Meghan O'Daniel

AGENDA

- **Public Forum, 5:35pm**
- **Next Meeting Confirmation**
- **Review Final Report Timeline**
- **Continue Ordinance Review**
- **Sub-Committee Updates**

Public Forum was opened at 5:35pm. No members of the public were present. Public forum was closed at 5:36pm.

Karunungan began the meeting by reviewing the agenda. She asked if the group would prefer to meet on July 24th or July 31st and said that she was available for both.

Wight shared that she had a preference for the 31st. The group agreed that that date worked.

Karunungan suggested that the group skip August and meet in September. The group agreed.

Wight asked if Karunungan would be able to give PACC an update on Wednesday, August 23rd. Karunungan said she was available.

Karunungan continued by asking the group if September 25th worked for the next meeting. Wight and Kettler had conflicts so Karunungan suggested the 18th instead. The group agreed.

Karunungan moved on to the next agenda item – the timeline for the final report. October is still the goal to get a draft ready for review. Today and in July the group will continue going over ordinances. August and September will be used to connect on other areas to review before getting the final draft of

Karunungan began the agenda item focusing on ordinance items. She said that Kettler made all of the adjustments to Article 1 that were suggested by the group.

Hurley said she thought it looked good.

No one else had any comments.

Karunungan asked if we answered the question about exotic animals and Kettler said no. She feels we should include birds and fish but that there may be some pushback so feels we should leave it out for now.

She continued by moving on to Article 2 and began sharing her screen. She began by asking to discuss the term “vicious” and was wondering if the word could be changed to “dangerous”. “Vicious” has a malicious intent behind it but some dogs are reactive out of fear. Kettler agreed and said that she would change that.

Everyone else agreed as well.

Hurley shared that she found that incentives instead of requirements are better when it comes to sterilization. Right now, there’s a discount for licensing if your dog is spayed/neutered, which is good. Hurley will share the articles that she found.

Kettler shared that she was open to doing whatever the group wanted to do or that the group could leave it up to the counsel – including the 2 different positions in the final document.

Tansley asked if it would be productive to have them need to approve something within the overall approval of the final report.

Wight cautioned the group not to go too far outside of the focus of the charge tasked to the task force.

Karunungan reminded the group that we were tasked with considering the licensing of outdoor cats.

Kettler shared that there are a number of ordinance sections that don’t fit neatly within the bounds so would we put those in an appendix of “further recommendations” or just put them in?

Karunungan said that we should get in as much as we can as makes sense. Knowing that some of the more difficult or contentious ones could be in an appendix.

Kettler continued that when she finalized Article 2 & Article 3 that she’ll try to do that and see how everyone feels about the breakout at the next meeting.

Karunungan continued with 5-16 – which focuses on service animals. It is currently federal law, so does not necessarily need to be included in the ordinance.

Kettler shared that it’s something the City could put in if they wanted to.

Hurley agreed. Adding in anything about service animals can open up the door to some gray areas.

Wight noted that it has already been passed separately that “Urban Park Ranger” was added to 5-13.

Karunungan continued that Tansley had a question about off-leash cats.

Tansley asked about off-leash cats and feels that this side of things is trickier than the dog side. He doesn’t want to get bogged down by cat things but was curious about what others thought.

Hurley agreed that enforcing the cat thing is going to be a challenge but that isn’t necessarily what the Task Force needs to be worried about. Our focus is the ordinance piece.

Kettler agreed.

Karunungan moved on to the next section – licensing. She asked Kettler to present the changes.

Kettler began that we are recommending that cats be licensed.

Kalisz agreed but voiced that people who have indoor cats will most likely not oblige.

Karunungan suggested they add incentives like Hurley suggested in to section 5-18.

Kettler agreed. She continued that they leave the sterilization section for the appendix of the final report.

Hurley asked if we would consider including a sliding scale suggestion for the ordinance part about licensing to avoid this being a cost prohibited process.

Kalisz suggested a scholarship program.

Karunungan also suggested the idea of a discount for households with multiple animals.

Tansley felt that this would incentivize people to have more animals.

Karunungan pushed back on that it wouldn't encourage people to get more animals, but could encourage people with multiple animals to get them licensed.

She continued that we can either leave it as is, recommend that counsel consider making it accessible to everyone regardless of money, and/or include incentives for licensing.

Wight suggested adding some language about volunteering.

Kettler asked if we should specify what percentages of the fees go where.

Hurley said yes having that information included would be helpful.

Kalisz agreed.

She continued by asking about the fees of licensing dogs vs. cats and feels that they should be different.

Tansley asked if the fee is supposed to reflect the impact they have on the City?

Hurley agreed and stated that dog licensing fees can go towards infrastructure in the City that are there for dogs (dog poop bag stands, dog parks, etc.).

Everyone agreed.

Karunungan mentioned that also CSO calls are more often about dogs compared cats.

That concluded the group work on Article 2.

Karunungan continued by re-sharing her screen for the group to review Article 3. She asked Kettler to begin by sharing the changes she has made so far.

Kettler began with the penalties section and said that she mostly brought things up to speed with where most other communities are.

Karunungan asked if there were any provisions about restorative justice options.

Wight looked up the noise ordinance piece of things to see if it is mentioned in there. She found that it is in there and shared the link with the group. She suggested that we could use that language.

Everyone agreed that adding a restorative justice piece made sense.

Kettler said she would add that in.

Kalisz asked if fines could be included on signage so that people would know how much the fines are for breaking rules.

Wight suggested having a QR code in case fees change over time, but agreed that it is important to have the fees be known by the community. She said that the off-leash committee would consider this as they think through signage.

Kettler continued by sharing the changes to the impoundment section. She said that she just cleaned and tightened it up a bit. And that if the animal is a stray, made it very clear that it needs to be taken in not just left out on the street.

Kettler moved on to the cruelty section. She said that she added failure to provide veterinary care and abandonment to the section. She commented that most cases of animal cruelty go to the State.

Kettler suggested adding a veterinarian and a certified animal behavior to attend animal control meetings.

Karunungan noted that it was 6:50pm and that the group would be pivoting to sub-committee updates.

Hurley gave the education update and shared that they have started to write their report and suggestions for the report with an appendix of what that group has already done in terms of outreach. They're in the final stage of getting everything prepared for City Council.

Kalisz shared that she has finally finished going through the data for the first year. She's coding the data so that she is getting information that's easier to see in pie charts etc.

Karunungan gave the update for the off-leash subcommittee by giving a glimpse at the off-leash survey results, which were very divided. She shared graphs showing which areas were popular and no popular and the open, qualitative comments. She continued by sharing the areas that the committee decided would not be piloted based on the feedback. She then shared the possible pilot locations. She said she was going to share these slides with the group via e-mail and is open to comments/ideas from the group.

Karunungan adjourned the meeting at 7pm.

PACC Dog Task Force Meeting

Monday June 26th, 2023 at 5:30pm

In attendance: Maria Karunungan, Lori Kettler, Joanne Kalisz, Nina Hurley, Kyle Tansley, Cindi Wight & Meghan O'Daniel

AGENDA

- **Public Forum, 5:35pm**
- **Next Meeting Confirmation**
- **Review Final Report Timeline**
- **Continue Ordinance Review**
- **Sub-Committee Updates**

Public Forum was opened at 5:35pm. No members of the public were present. Public forum was closed at 5:36pm.

Karunungan began the meeting by reviewing the agenda. She asked if the group would prefer to meet on July 24th or July 31st and said that she was available for both.

Wight shared that she had a preference for the 31st. The group agreed that that date worked.

Karunungan suggested that the group skip August and meet in September. The group agreed.

Wight asked if Karunungan would be able to give PACC an update on Wednesday, August 23rd. Karunungan said she was available.

Karunungan continued by asking the group if September 25th worked for the next meeting. Wight and Kettler had conflicts so Karunungan suggested the 18th instead. The group agreed.

Karunungan moved on to the next agenda item – the timeline for the final report. October is still the goal to get a draft ready for review. Today and in July the group will continue going over ordinances. August and September will be used to connect on other areas to review before getting the final draft of

Karunungan began the agenda item focusing on ordinance items. She said that Kettler made all of the adjustments to Article 1 that were suggested by the group.

Hurley said she thought it looked good.

No one else had any comments.

Karunungan asked if we answered the question about exotic animals and Kettler said no. She feels we should include birds and fish but that there may be some pushback so feels we should leave it out for now.

She continued by moving on to Article 2 and began sharing her screen. She began by asking to discuss the term “vicious” and was wondering if the word could be changed to “dangerous”. “Vicious” has a malicious intent behind it but some dogs are reactive out of fear. Kettler agreed and said that she would change that.

Everyone else agreed as well.

Hurley shared that she found that incentives instead of requirements are better when it comes to sterilization. Right now, there’s a discount for licensing if your dog is spayed/neutered, which is good. Hurley will share the articles that she found.

Kettler shared that she was open to doing whatever the group wanted to do or that the group could leave it up to the counsel – including the 2 different positions in the final document.

Tansley asked if it would be productive to have them need to approve something within the overall approval of the final report.

Wight cautioned the group not to go too far outside of the focus of the charge tasked to the task force.

Karunungan reminded the group that we were tasked with considering the licensing of outdoor cats.

Kettler shared that there are a number of ordinance sections that don’t fit neatly within the bounds so would we put those in an appendix of “further recommendations” or just put them in?

Karunungan said that we should get in as much as we can as makes sense. Knowing that some of the more difficult or contentious ones could be in an appendix.

Kettler continued that when she finalized Article 2 & Article 3 that she’ll try to do that and see how everyone feels about the breakout at the next meeting.

Karunungan continued with 5-16 – which focuses on service animals. It is currently federal law, so does not necessarily need to be included in the ordinance.

Kettler shared that it’s something the City could put in if they wanted to.

Hurley agreed. Adding in anything about service animals can open up the door to some gray areas.

Wight noted that it has already been passed separately that “Urban Park Ranger” was added to 5-13.

Karunungan continued that Tansley had a question about off-leash cats.

Tansley asked about off-leash cats and feels that this side of things is trickier than the dog side. He doesn’t want to get bogged down by cat things but was curious about what others thought.

Hurley agreed that enforcing the cat thing is going to be a challenge but that isn’t necessarily what the Task Force needs to be worried about. Our focus is the ordinance piece.

Kettler agreed.

Karunungan moved on to the next section – licensing. She asked Kettler to present the changes.

Kettler began that we are recommending that cats be licensed.

Kalisz agreed but voiced that people who have indoor cats will most likely not oblige.

Karunungan suggested they add incentives like Hurley suggested in to section 5-18.

Kettler agreed. She continued that they leave the sterilization section for the appendix of the final report.

Hurley asked if we would consider including a sliding scale suggestion for the ordinance part about licensing to avoid this being a cost prohibited process.

Kalisz suggested a scholarship program.

Karunungan also suggested the idea of a discount for households with multiple animals.

Tansley felt that this would incentivize people to have more animals.

Karunungan pushed back on that it wouldn't encourage people to get more animals, but could encourage people with multiple animals to get them licensed.

She continued that we can either leave it as is, recommend that counsel consider making it accessible to everyone regardless of money, and/or include incentives for licensing.

Wight suggested adding some language about volunteering.

Kettler asked if we should specify what percentages of the fees go where.

Hurley said yes having that information included would be helpful.

Kalisz agreed.

She continued by asking about the fees of licensing dogs vs. cats and feels that they should be different.

Tansley asked if the fee is supposed to reflect the impact they have on the City?

Hurley agreed and stated that dog licensing fees can go towards infrastructure in the City that are there for dogs (dog poop bag stands, dog parks, etc.).

Everyone agreed.

Karunungan mentioned that also CSO calls are more often about dogs compared cats.

That concluded the group work on Article 2.

Karunungan continued by re-sharing her screen for the group to review Article 3. She asked Kettler to begin by sharing the changes she has made so far.

Kettler began with the penalties section and said that she mostly brought things up to speed with where most other communities are.

Karunungan asked if there were any provisions about restorative justice options.

Wight looked up the noise ordinance piece of things to see if it is mentioned in there. She found that it is in there and shared the link with the group. She suggested that we could use that language.

Everyone agreed that adding a restorative justice piece made sense.

Kettler said she would add that in.

Kalisz asked if fines could be included on signage so that people would know how much the fines are for breaking rules.

Wight suggested having a QR code in case fees change over time, but agreed that it is important to have the fees be known by the community. She said that the off-leash committee would consider this as they think through signage.

Kettler continued by sharing the changes to the impoundment section. She said that she just cleaned and tightened it up a bit. And that if the animal is a stray, made it very clear that it needs to be taken in not just left out on the street.

Kettler moved on to the cruelty section. She said that she added failure to provide veterinary care and abandonment to the section. She commented that most cases of animal cruelty go to the State.

Kettler suggested adding a veterinarian and a certified animal behavior to attend animal control meetings.

Karunungan noted that it was 6:50pm and that the group would be pivoting to sub-committee updates.

Hurley gave the education update and shared that they have started to write their report and suggestions for the report with an appendix of what that group has already done in terms of outreach. They're in the final stage of getting everything prepared for City Council.

Kalisz shared that she has finally finished going through the data for the first year. She's coding the data so that she is getting information that's easier to see in pie charts etc.

Karunungan gave the update for the off-leash subcommittee by giving a glimpse at the off-leash survey results, which were very divided. She shared graphs showing which areas were popular and no popular and the open, qualitative comments. She continued by sharing the areas that the committee decided would not be piloted based on the feedback. She then shared the possible pilot locations. She said she was going to share these slides with the group via e-mail and is open to comments/ideas from the group.

Karunungan adjourned the meeting at 7pm.