

BCC 10-11-16

Bachteler, James J

From: Lowack, Brian on behalf of Morrone, John
Sent: Thursday, October 06, 2016 8:14 AM
To: BoardRecords
Subject: FW: Proposed Amendments to Pinellas County Code

The below is correspondence related to Tuesday's BCC meeting.

Thank you,
Brian Lowack

RECEIVED
BOARD OF
COMMISSIONERS
PINELLAS COUNTY FLORIDA
2016 OCT - 6 AM 8:50

From: Sandy Mesmer [mailto:smesmer@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 06, 2016 5:23 AM
To: Morrone, John <jmorrone@co.pinellas.fl.us>
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Pinellas County Code

John Morrone, Commissioner

Dear Commissioner Morrone,

I am very concerned about the proposed Ordinance amending the Pinellas County Code concerning dog breeders due to be brought before the Commissioners October 11.

1. This amendment assumes guilt before the fact.

As a responsible breeder who has lived in Clearwater since 1981 with a spotless record with the County, I don't understand why I, and other local responsible breeders, should be penalized through no fault of our own. Existing ordinances are plenty to sniff out negligent dog breeders, and after, all the bottom line we are all looking for is adequate health and well being of all our pets. Existing ordinances are more than sufficient to sniff out negligent dog OWNERS – why are we looking to add an extra layer of bureaucracy? Who stands to gain from that? Certainly not our dogs. I would be very interested in seeing evidence of what sort of "flood of negligent dog breeders" the County feels the current Ordinance has been inadequate in dealing with.

2. The amendment concerning having water outside at all times for dogs needs an exception for dog shows.

The proposal is in ignorance of the facts of a dog show. Dogs are transported from the grooming areas, where they routinely have plenty of water, to the rings. Does one need to have a water bottle with a hose going into the dog's mouth as it walks to the ring? Obviously patently ridiculous. The current rule which states that dogs be provided sufficient water to maintain normal hydration is fully adequate. Again, why are proposals being made to penalize responsible individuals who have done nothing wrong?

3. Reducing oversight of "rescue groups" from an anytime inspection to monthly reports would be disastrous for owners of lost pets found or impounded by such groups.

Even the most responsible pet owner can experience the devastation of losing their animal. Assuming that all owners of lost pets are negligent is ridiculous. A gate not fully latched by a child can mean that a normally secure pet is out on walkabout. If such "rescue" groups only need to give notice of the dogs in their care once a month, this could mean that such owners have to wait 30 days to know whether the group has their dog. And as such groups have a routine policy of spaying and neutering any intact animal found, this could mean the loss of a valuable breeding animal, with no recourse.

The bottom line? We currently have adequate Ordinances to cover dog breeders in our County. This amendment would penalize responsible, tax paying individuals who have done nothing wrong, add a layer of unneeded bureaucracy to the system and unnecessarily traumatize owners of lost pets. Please say NO! to the proposed amendments.

Best, Sandy Mesmer

Past President Clearwater Kennel Club
Author Animal Planet's Dogs 101 Yorkshire Terriers
Author Animal Planet's Dogs 101 Pomeranians
Author How to Turn Your Dog Into a Show Off

Bachteler, James J

BCE 10-11-16 #6

From: Greenleaf, Kim
Sent: Friday, October 07, 2016 3:24 PM
To: BoardRecords
Cc: bccassistants
Subject: PROPOSED ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE PINELLAS COUNTY CODE ANIMAL SERVICES:

OPPOSED

Importance: Low

Kimberly H. Greenleaf

Executive Aide to Commissioner Dave Eggers
Pinellas Board of County Commissioners, District 4
315 Court Street, Clearwater, FL 33756
727-464-3276 office
727-464-3022 fax
kgreenleaf@pinellascounty.org

www.pinellascounty.org
[Subscribe to county updates and news](#)

All government correspondence is subject to the public records law.

From: Kerrie Kuper [mailto:kerriekuper@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, October 07, 2016 3:00 PM
To: Justice, Charlie <cjustice@co.pinellas.fl.us>; Long, Janet C <JanetCLong@co.pinellas.fl.us>; Gerard, Pat <pgerard@co.pinellas.fl.us>; Eggers, Dave <deggers@co.pinellas.fl.us>; Seel, Karen <kseel@co.pinellas.fl.us>; Morroni, John <jmorroni@co.pinellas.fl.us>; Welch, Kenneth <kwelch@co.pinellas.fl.us>
Subject: [BULK] PROPOSED ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE PINELLAS COUNTY CODE ANIMAL SERVICES:
Importance: Low

Dear Commissioners:

I am writing to OPPOSE recent proposed changes to Pinellas County Animal services code to be brought before the commissioners on October 11. 2016. Specifically:

ANYONE WHO SELLS ONE LITTER of dogs a year being specified as a PET DEALER is unnecessary and extremely intrusive. ONE LITTER COULD EASILY CONSIST OF ONE PUPPY WITH MANY BREEDS OF DOGS. The current code is sufficient. DO YOU really want to subject a family with ONE PET that decided to breed it, possibly to have their family learn about the birth of puppies or kitten be subject to laws and be classified a PET DEALER and subject to zoning, fees, and inspection of their HOME etc when their dog possibly gives birth to ONE PUPPY? **This is government overreach at a minimum.**

AND county operated or city operated animal service agencies and registered non profit humane organizations should NOT be exempt from the same standards of a private person. There are MANY so called NON profit humane organizations that are anything BUT that and disguise themselves as such but are in the business or selling dogs and cats for a profit for their group.

PUBLIC NUISANCE: Should someone having a new puppy, a sick dog or possibly a new dog in their home who is upset and whining or crying a bit really have their pet declared a public nuisance if the dog is upset and barks or crys for 15 minutes twice a day two separate dates during a 3 day period? **HAVE ANYONE OF YOU EVER HAD A NEW PUPPY in your home??** Did the new puppy sometimes CRY for more than 15 minutes twice in 8 hours for a couple of days while learning to adjust to his/her new home?? This again is over reach by the county. The current laws are sufficient to cover nuisance barking.

Under the proposed ordinance, standards of care for PET DEALERS (meaning someone living in a private home who has ONE LITTER of puppies a year under your proposed ordinance) would be established by the department of animal services with NO legislative or community oversight. Permits could be revoked or suspended at the discretion of ONE director. **DO YOU WANT TO HAVE ONE PERSON THE AUTHORITY TO COME INTO YOUR PRIVATE HOME WITHOUT NOTICE AND INSPECT YOUR PRIVATE HOME, TAKE PICTURES, INSPECT YOUR PREMISES BECAUSE YOU HAVE ONE LITTER OF PUPPIES A YEAR AND ARE CONSIDERED A PET DEALER?** I don't believe ANY you would, and the constitutionality of this would have to be questioned also.

The current code regarding hydration for dogs is sufficient and does NOT need to be changed. I show dogs and do lure-coursing and racing with my dogs outside. They are off lead also at times while they are performing their tasks. **HOW is someone supposed to have a bowl of water in front of the dogs at all times when they are racing, coursing, performing at a show? HAVE any of you watched dog shows, obedience trials or other dog performance events?** It is a unrealistic and unnecessary change in the ordinance to require water in front of the dogs constantly. Why would you want to penalize a responsible dog owner who has done nothing wrong. The current code is sufficient.

Reducing the oversight of "rescue groups" from a anytime inspection to monthly reports is a NOT a good idea for people that have lost pets and they are found or impounded by such groups. IF someone loses a dog through no fault of their own, such as a utility person leaving a gate unlocked or a child accidentally letting a dog out of the house, if the dog was picked up by a "rescue group" there would be NO way for that person to know if the rescue group had their dog in their care for possibly ONE MONTH...!!! AND that dog may have been sold or placed by the rescue group in the interim. I have had this happen to dogs of my breeding and I was unable to retrieve a dog I bred and had NO recourse to retrieve the dog. I can tell you from personal experience it is devastating to NOT be able to retrieve a dog you are responsible for and love.

The bottom line. We currently have adequate Ordinances in our County. These amendments would penalize responsible, tax paying individuals who have done nothing wrong, add a layer of unneeded bureaucracy to the system and unnecessarily traumatize owners of lost pets. Please say NO! to the proposed amendments.

Thank you.

--

Kerrie Kuper
Past President Clearwater Kennel Club
AKC Judge

Bachteler, James J

BCC 10-11-16 #6

From: Lowack, Brian on behalf of Morrone, John
Sent: Monday, October 10, 2016 8:30 AM
To: form_engine@fs30.formsite.com
Cc: BoardRecords
Subject: RE: [BULK] Online Customer Service Contact Us Form Result #7887690

opposed

Craig,

Thank you for taking the time to share your thoughts on the proposed Animal Services ordinance. Commissioner Morrone will not be here for the vote however. I will make sure your opposition goes into the public record.

Have a great week.
Brian Lowack

From: form_engine@fs30.formsite.com [mailto:form_engine@fs30.formsite.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 08, 2016 8:38 AM
To: Morrone, John <jmorrone@co.pinellas.fl.us>
Subject: [BULK] Online Customer Service Contact Us Form Result #7887690
Importance: Low

This information is the result of a Pinellas Online Customer Service form submission from the Pinellas County web site.

Direction of inquiry * General Information
Commissioner John Morrone - District 6

Subject * County animal ordinance

Message * Hello Commissioner Marroni
I was recently advised of the proposed changes to the animal ordinance. I believe that many of the changes are good but I feel that the one litter a year proposal for pet owners who enjoy sharing an occasional litter of puppies with the community is unnecessarily restrictive to the public not to mention the cost and paper work involved with it. I understand the need to control the abusers but you are lumping the responsible people in the community in with the undesirable puppy mill gangsters. You are most likely a pet owner your self or know some one who is and has purchased a puppy from a local citizen so you understand my thoughts. For the responsible people in the community your proposal is creating an unnecessary burden and cost to good citizens who act with common sense. We need less government regulation not more. Pursue the bad guys not the good ones. not to mention who is going to pay for this policing action is this really a good idea? Hope your vote is for Trump!

Your Email Address * craig@saltcreekboatworks.com

Bachteler, James J

BCC 10-11-16 #6

From: Lowack, Brian on behalf of Morrioni, John
Sent: Monday, October 10, 2016 8:42 AM
To: Deborah Schmidt
Cc: BoardRecords
Subject: RE: Pinellas County Animal Ordinance

OPPOSED

Deborah,

Thank you for taking the time to share your thoughts on the proposed Animal Services ordinance. Commissioner Morrioni will not be here for the vote however. I will make sure your opposition goes into the public record.

Have a great week.
Brian Lowack

From: Deborah Schmidt [mailto:DSchmidt134@verizon.net]
Sent: Sunday, October 09, 2016 10:03 PM
To: Morrioni, John <jmorrioni@co.pinellas.fl.us>
Subject: Pinellas County Animal Ordinance

Dear Commissioner Morrioni:

I am a member of the Dog Training Club of St. Petersburg, and the owner of two poodles, a 10-year old small standard poodle, Hans, and a 15-month old miniature poodle, Rex. I also had another miniature poodle, Beethoven, who lived to be almost 19 years old. Beethoven earned his Championship Agility title in United Kennel Club (UKC), as well as multiple agility titles in American Kennel Club (AKC). Hans has earned his UKC Championship title, as well as multiple titles in AKC, and is now participating in Agility trials at the highest level in both UKC and AKC. Rex is doing very well in his early agility training. The breeders I purchased my dogs from are Responsible Breeders, who have contracts with clauses requiring them to approve any rehome home, if the owners have to find a new home for the dog, or take the dog back. They have also a long history of producing highly recognized poodles, including best of breed at Westminster. I chose to get purebred dogs, who were healthy, had the body structure, and the temperament to participate in agility, do well, have fun, and work as a team with me, that possibly would not have been suitable if they were mixed breed shelter dogs.

I am writing to oppose certain changes to the Pinellas County Animal Ordinance. I support the rights of Responsible Hobby Breeders to produce healthy, well socialized puppies by occasionally breeding their dogs in Pinellas County. I do not support irresponsible owners, that breed unproven and/or mixed breed dogs with no regard for temperament, ability, or health clearances. I do not support any change to the County code that changes the current definition of Pet Dealer, unless that change includes a definition and exemption for Responsible Hobby Breeders, that clearly differentiates them from irresponsible breeders.

I do not support the proposed definition of public nuisance as proposed, as there could be many reasons why a dog might bark for 15 minutes at one time. This definition says nothing about how easily the barking can be heard, nor does it address reason why dogs may bark. If I am not home, and someone comes on my property, my dogs will bark at them, and I want them to bark. They are defending my property. If you are near my house doing something unusual, I want my dogs to bark at you. It is possible to provide distractions to keep dogs from barking due to boredom or separation anxiety. I know that contractor noise, children yelling and running, and lawnmowers running nearby or by the windows of my home is annoying to me and to my dogs, and rightly so. I

am sure that if that dog is repeatedly left on its own, it will be barking multiple times a day, and certainly more than twice in a 3-day period. This definition is not reasonable.

Finally, the definition of the portion of the ordinance that defines kennels needs to be changed to encourage more owner-handler dog training, which would reduce the number of dogs in shelters, and increase adoptions. I would request that the definition of "kennel" exempt any training facility that trains dogs and handlers together, provided that that facility does not also board dogs or provide "daycare" services. Well trained dogs are far less likely to end up in shelters, so businesses and training organizations that help people train their dogs actually help reduce the number of shelter pets, and provide a valuable service to the public. Calling these businesses a "kennel" and holding them to care requirements, regulations, and inspections set for kennels is unnecessary, since the dogs are seldom on premises for more than an hour or two, and their owners are always present.

Thank you for your consideration for the ways that these proposed changes and current kennel definition would affect responsible breeders, owners, and their dogs.

Sincerely,
Deborah Schmidt

Bachteler, James J

BCC 10-11-16 #6

From: Vandenberg, Courtney
Sent: Monday, October 10, 2016 1:09 PM
To: BoardRecords
Subject: E-mails regarding 10.11.16 Agenda Item #6
Attachments: Pin. Co. Animal Ord; Proposed ordinance amending Chapter 14 of the County Code relating to animals; Pinellas County Animal Ordinance; hobby breeder/kennel proposed ordinance changes; Animal Code Change - Redefinition of Pet Dealer - Opposed; Pinellas County Animal Ordinance; Pinellas County Animal Ordinance ; Regarding proposed changed to the Pinellas County Animal Control Ordinance; proposed animal ordinance changes; Pinellas County Proposed Animal Ordinance; Changes to the Pinellas Animal Cruelty Ordinance

Attached are e-mails regarding Agenda Item #6 – Ordinance amending Chapter 14 of the County Code relating to animals.

RECEIVED
BOARD OF
2016 OCT 10 PM 4:16
BOARD OF COUNTY
COMMISSIONERS
PINELLAS COUNTY FLORIDA

BCC 10-11-16 #6

Bachteler, James J

From: Diane Miles <sheltieluvr@earthlink.net>
Sent: Monday, October 10, 2016 12:00 PM
To: Justice, Charlie
Subject: Pin. Co. Animal Ord

opposed

Dear County Commissioner:

I am writing to oppose certain changes to the Pinellas County Animal Ordinance, and suggest a minor change to the definition of "Kennel".

I support the rights of Responsible Hobby Breeders to produce healthy, well socialized puppies by occasionally breeding their dogs in Pinellas County. I do not support irresponsible OWNERS, that breed unproven and/or mixed breed dogs with no regard for temperament, ability, or health clearances.

I do not support ANY change to the County code that changes the current definition of Pet Dealer, unless that change includes a definition and exemption for Responsible Hobby Breeders, that clearly differentiates them from irresponsible breeders.

I do not support the proposed definition of public nuisance as proposed, as there could be many reasons why a dog might bark for 15 minutes at one time. This definition says nothing about how easily the barking can be heard, nor does it address reason why dogs may bark. If I am not home, and you come and mess around on my property, my dogs will bark you. If you are near my house doing something unusual, I WANT my dogs to bark at you. I am the first to agree that a dog constantly barking out of sheer boredom is annoying, but I also find contractor noise, children screaming, and lawnmowers running annoying. I'd be willing to bet that if that dog is repeatedly left on its own, it will be barking multiple times a day, and certainly more than twice in a 3 day period. This definition is not reasonable.

Finally, there is a portion of the ordinance that should be changed to encourage more owner-handler dog training, which would REDUCE the number of dogs in shelters, and increase adoption. I would also request that the definition of "kennel" exempt any training facility that trains dogs AND handlers together, provided that that facility does not also board dogs or provide "daycare" services. Well trained dogs are far less likely to end up in shelters, so businesses and training organizations that help people train their dogs actually help reduce the number of shelter pets, and provide a valuable service to the public. Calling these businesses a "kennel" and holding them to care requirements set for kennels is unnecessary, since the dogs are seldom on premises for more than an hour or two, and their owners are always present.

Thank you for your consideration

Sincerely,

Diane Miles

RECEIVED
BOARD OF
2016 OCT 10 PM 4:16
BOARD OF COUNTY
COMMISSIONERS
PINELLAS COUNTY FLORIDA

Bachteler, James J

BCC 10-11-16
OPPOSED #16

From: Katie M <trademarkbark@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 10, 2016 11:36 AM
To: Justice, Charlie; Long, Janet C; Gerard, Pat; Eggers, Dave; Seel, Karen; Morrioni, John; Welch, Kenneth
Subject: Proposed ordinance amending Chapter 14 of the County Code relating to animals

Good morning to all,

I am a life-long Florida native, who has lived in various counties of central Florida, Pinellas County included. I was hoping to purchase a home in Pinellas County next year. Unfortunately, I was just informed of the proposed Animal Control ordinance amendment with new verbiage, defining anyone who advertises or engages in the sale of one (1) or more litters of Dogs or Cats per year as "pet dealers". This definition is ludicrous for one litter produced annually! In addition, the licensing requirements are quite harsh and stringent, and many find them overly invasive. Such laws with unannounced inspections, and other such characteristics, are similar to those for keeping wildlife; these don't fit customary requirements for an individual who might breed a single litter of puppies (or kittens) in a year. Volume breeders (i.e. those who produce 3-4 litters or more) should fall into this category, but not individuals who breed a single litter (that could be only 1-2 offspring) a year. Also, what are the requirements for those of us who breed a litter every few years? Are we exempt? I do not see anything in the amendment that includes this deviation.

Additionally, the requirement for show dogs/field trial dogs at outdoor events to have "constant access to water" is a blanket requirement that is unnecessary. People who compete in these events understand their dogs' needs and ensure that they have the necessary hydration provided. Some dogs, when left with free access to water, will drink until they become ill. It is the owner's responsibility to ensure their dog is well hydrated, by offering water, or alternatives such as ice cubes, cool fruit, or cooling coats/mats in the crates to reduce body temperature. There are veterinarians in attendance at these events, and I've yet to hear one make this "constant water" recommendation to those of us at the event. It would be a travesty for an owner to be penalized because of an arbitrary law with no written exception, based upon no actual medical criterion.

It is my sincere hope that this amendment does not pass as written, as it will prevent me and my family from moving to a county where I've lived happily in the past, and had hoped to return to again. In addition, it will force many long time residents to leave Pinellas county, as opposed to kowtowing to the new ordinance. There are many neighboring counties who do not have such harsh ordinances, and they will definitely feel the positive influence as hobby breeders search for a more understanding place to live with their dogs (and cats).

I am unable to attend the meeting in person, so I wanted to voice my feelings on the matter in hopes that it can be taken into consideration at the meeting.

Kind regards,

Kathryn McKewen

RECEIVED
BOARD OF
2016 OCT 10 PM 4:16
SANTA ROSA COUNTY
COMMISSIONERS
PINELLAS COUNTY FLORIDA

BCC 10-11-16 #6

Bachteler, James J

opposed

From: dwestmwlaw@aol.com
Sent: Monday, October 10, 2016 10:02 AM
To: Justice, Charlie; Eggers, Dave; Long, Janet C; Morroni, John; Seel, Karen; Welch, Kenneth; Gerard, Pat
Subject: Pinellas County Animal Ordinance

Dear County Commissioners:

I am writing in opposition to the proposed changes to the Pinellas County Animal Ordinance. I am a Life Member of the Dog Training Club of St. Petersburg, Inc. I support the rights of responsible pet owners to occasionally breed a litter of puppies/kittens in Pinellas County. I do not support any changes to the current policy that will change the current definition of "pet dealer". In addition, I do not agree with the proposed definition of kennel. Our club and training facility does not board dogs. We offer classes in various dog activities (obedience, agility, flyball, scent work.....) to our members and the public. Dog training facilities that do not board dogs overnight should be exempt from being classified as a kennel.

I think this proposed ordinance is entirely too restrictive and has not been well thought out. I hope all our county commissioners vote against the proposed changes.

Best Regards,

Desma L. West

Desma L. West, Esq.
Morachnick & West, P.A.
12126 Seminole Blvd.
Largo, FL 33778
e-mail: Dwestmwlaw@aol.com
727-397-1941
727-397-5683 fax

This e-mail, along with any files transmitted with it, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain information that is confidential or privileged. If this e-mail is not addressed to you (or if you have any reason to believe that it is not intended for you), please notify the sender by return e-mail or by telephoning us (collect) at 727-397-1941 and delete this message immediately from your computer. Any unauthorized review, use, retention, disclosure, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited.

RECEIVED
BOARD OF
2016 OCT 10 PM 4:16
ADAM W. MORRISON
COMMISSIONER
PINELLAS COUNTY FLORIDA

Bachteler, James J

BCC 10-11-16 #6

From: Joan Smith <jsmith51@tampabay.rr.com>
Sent: Monday, October 10, 2016 6:22 AM
To: Justice, Charlie
Subject: hobby breeder/kennel proposed ordinance changes

opposed

Dear Chairman Justice:

Hobby Breeders

I am writing to oppose certain changes to the Pinellas County Animal Ordinance, and suggest a minor change to the definition of a kennel.

Training Classes

The ordinance should not include facilities and businesses where dog training classes are held. The owners typically walk around in circles for an hour, then leave. Though they receive valuable training and behavior information during that time, they are in no way, shape, or form a kennel.

Pet Dealer

The term, "occasionally" as used in the proposed ordinance, needs a better definition.

I support the rights of responsible hobby breeders to produce healthy dogs by occasionally breeding their dogs in Pinellas County. Breed registration papers nor veterinary health certificates are the same as checking for genetic problems.

I do not support any change to the code that changes the current definition of pet dealer, unless that change includes a definition and exemption for responsible hobby breeders.

Public Nuisance Barking

I am the first to agree that a dog constantly barking is beyond annoying. But there are exceptions:

- The definition of public nuisance as proposed, calls a dog a public nuisance if they bark for more than 15 minutes at one time.
- If you are near my house doing something unusual, my dogs will bark at you if I am not at home.
- This definition says nothing about how easily the barking can be heard. My dogs have been surgically bark-softened, meaning I can hear them bark when they are outside and I am inside, but it is not the loud or screaming bark that many dogs have.
- If I am not at home and it takes more than 15 minutes to break in complete the robbery, my dogs will bark for as long as it takes to get attention.

Thank you for your consideration

Sincerely,
Joan M. Smith

RECEIVED
BOARD OF
2016 OCT 10 PM 4:16
BOARD OF
COMMISSIONERS
PINELLAS COUNTY FLORIDA

Bachteler, James J

BCC 10-11-16 #6

From: Lori Landis <llandis@tampabay.rr.com>
Sent: Monday, October 10, 2016 12:44 AM
To: Justice, Charlie
Subject: Animal Code Change - Redefinition of Pet Dealer - Opposed

Charlie Justice, Commissioner

Dear Commissioner Justice,

As a resident of Pinellas County, I am writing to state my concerns regarding the redefinition of "pet dealer" in the upcoming animal code changes.

The definition of "pet dealer" is unclear for persons who do not breed and sell a litter of puppies every year. Are residents who breed a litter every other year or every three years required to be licensed and inspected every year even if they don't breed a litter that year? This amounts to a tax on possible dog breeders and penalizes people who are doing nothing wrong.

The requirement for an unscheduled inspection would be difficult, if not impossible, for the majority of occasional breeders since they clearly wouldn't be able to support themselves by breeding one litter a year and most likely work outside the home. If the person isn't home when the inspector arrives, will their license be revoked simply because they work for a living and were not available?

At the Commission meeting on 8/23/16, Doug Brightwell was unable to state a number of people who would be affected by this code change. He said that there were complaints, but that often they were unable to locate the person due to them having moved or the puppy being purchased in a Wal-Mart parking lot. He also stated this was very difficult to regulate. Adding a license requirement will not change these facts and will not make finding these people any easier. How can you license people you can't locate? Relying on complaint-based and voluntary compliance is an uneven and unfair application of the law and penalizes honest citizens while giving a pass to those who won't comply anyway. Why pass a code change that you are unable to adequately and fairly enforce?

This code change has not been well thought out and has the unintended consequence of impacting law abiding citizens who are following the rules while inadequately addressing the perceived problem you wish to solve. How many 'serial breeders' actually exist in Pinellas County? Until this question can be answered, imposing this arbitrary definition of 'pet dealer' is premature.

Sincerely,

Lori Landis

RECEIVED
BOARD OF
2016 OCT 10 PM 4:16
ADAMANT COUNTY
COMMISSIONERS
PINELLAS COUNTY FLORIDA

Bachteler, James J

BCC 10-11-16 #6

From: Jacqueline Evans <moran_house@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 09, 2016 10:26 PM
To: Jacqueline Evans
Subject: Pinellas County Animal Ordinance

opposed

Dear County Commissioner:

I am writing to oppose certain changes to the Pinellas County Animal Ordinance, and suggest a minor change to the definition of "Kennel"

I support the rights of Responsible Hobby Breeders to produce healthy, well socialized puppies by occasionally breeding their dogs in Pinellas County. I do not support irresponsible OWNERS, that breed unproven and/or mixed breed dogs with no regard for temperament, ability, or health clearances. (Registration papers are not proof of temperament or ability, and veterinary health certificates are NOT proper health clearances).

I do not support ANY change to the County code that changes the current definition of Pet Dealer, unless that change includes a definition and exemption for Responsible Hobby Breeders, that clearly differentiates them from irresponsible breeders.

I do not support the proposed definition of public nuisance as proposed, as there could be many reasons why a dog might bark for 15 minutes at one time. This definition says nothing about how easily the barking can be heard, nor does it address reason why dogs may bark. If I am not home, and you come and mess around on my property, my dogs will bark you. If you are near my house doing something unusual, I WANT my dogs to bark at you. I am the first to agree that a dog constantly barking out of sheer boredom is annoying, but I also find contractor noise, children screaming, and lawnmowers running annoying. I'd be willing to bet that if that dog is repeatedly left on its own, it will be barking multiple times a day, and certainly more than twice in a 3 day period. This definition is not reasonable.

Finally, there is a portion of the ordinance that should be changed to encourage more owner-handler dog training, which would REDUCE the number of dogs in shelters, and increase adoption. I would also request that the definition of "kennel" exempt any training facility that trains dogs AND handlers together, provided that that facility does not also board dogs or provide "daycare" services. Well trained dogs are far less likely to end up in shelters, so businesses and training organizations that help people train their dogs actually help reduce the number of shelter pets, and provide a valuable service to the public. Calling these businesses a "kennel" and holding them to care requirements set for kennels is unnecessary, since the dogs are seldom on premises for more than an hour or two, and their owners are always present.

Thank you for your consideration

Sincerely,

Jacqueline Evans
AKC Breeder of Merit
Member Instructor Dog Training Club of St. Petersburg
Vice President Tampa Bay Area Shetland Sheepdog Club
www.costadelsolshelties.com

RECEIVED
BOARD OF
2016 OCT 10 PM 4:16
BOARD OF COUNTY
COMMISSIONERS
PINELLAS COUNTY FLORIDA

Bachteler, James J

BAC 10-11-16 HC

From: Deborah Schmidt <DSchmidt134@verizon.net>
Sent: Sunday, October 09, 2016 9:58 PM
To: Justice, Charlie
Subject: Pinellas County Animal Ordinance

opposed

Dear Chairman Justice:

I am a member of the Dog Training Club of St. Petersburg, and the owner of two poodles, a 10-year old small standard poodle, Hans, and a 15-month old miniature poodle, Rex. I also had another miniature poodle, Beethoven, who lived to be almost 19 years old. Beethoven earned his Championship Agility title in United Kennel Club (UKC), as well as multiple agility titles in American Kennel Club (AKC). Hans has earned his UKC Championship title, as well as multiple titles in AKC, and is now participating in Agility trials at the highest level in both UKC and AKC. Rex is doing very well in his early agility training. The breeders I purchased my dogs from are Responsible Breeders, who have contracts with clauses requiring them to approve any rehome home, if the owners have to find a new home for the dog, or take the dog back. They have also a long history of producing highly recognized poodles, including best of breed at Westminster. I chose to get purebred dogs, who were healthy, had the body structure, and the temperament to participate in agility, do well, have fun, and work as a team with me, that possibly would not have been suitable if they were mixed breed shelter dogs.

I am writing to oppose certain changes to the Pinellas County Animal Ordinance. I support the rights of Responsible Hobby Breeders to produce healthy, well socialized puppies by occasionally breeding their dogs in Pinellas County. I do not support irresponsible owners, that breed unproven and/or mixed breed dogs with no regard for temperament, ability, or health clearances. I do not support any change to the County code that changes the current definition of Pet Dealer, unless that change includes a definition and exemption for Responsible Hobby Breeders, that clearly differentiates them from irresponsible breeders.

I do not support the proposed definition of public nuisance as proposed, as there could be many reasons why a dog might bark for 15 minutes at one time. This definition says nothing about how easily the barking can be heard, nor does it address reason why dogs may bark. If I am not home, and someone comes on my property, my dogs will bark at them, and I want them to bark. They are defending my property. If you are near my house doing something unusual, I want my dogs to bark at you. It is possible to provide distractions to keep dogs from barking due to boredom or separation anxiety. I know that contractor noise, children yelling and running, and lawnmowers running nearby or by the windows of my home is annoying to me and to my dogs, and rightly so. I am sure that if that dog is repeatedly left on its own, it will be barking multiple times a day, and certainly more than twice in a 3-day period. This definition is not reasonable.

Finally, the definition of the portion of the ordinance that defines kennels needs to be changed to encourage more owner-handler dog training, which would reduce the number of dogs in shelters, and increase adoptions. I would request that the definition of "kennel" exempt any training facility that trains dogs and handlers together, provided that that facility does not also board dogs or provide "daycare" services. Well trained dogs are far less likely to end up in shelters, so businesses and training organizations that help people train their dogs actually help reduce the number of shelter pets, and provide a valuable service to the public. Calling these businesses a "kennel" and holding them to care requirements, regulations, and inspections set for kennels is unnecessary, since the dogs are seldom on premises for more than an hour or two, and their owners are always present.

Thank you for your consideration for the ways that these proposed changes and current kennel definition would affect responsible breeders, owners, and their dogs.

**Sincerely,
Deborah Schmidt**

BCC 10-11-16 #6

Bachteler, James J

From: PK Lichtenberger <pk@customfishing.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 09, 2016 9:53 PM
To: Justice, Charlie; Eggers, Dave; Long, Janet C; Morrone, John; Seel, Karen; Welch, Kenneth; Gerard, Pat
Subject: Regarding proposed changed to the Pinellas County Animal Control Ordinance

Dear Council Member:

My husband and I have lived in Pinellas County for over 35 years. We own a home in St. Petersburg and a business and commercial property in unincorporated Pinellas County.

I am a member and instructor at the Dog Training Club of St. Petersburg, a Member of Therapy Dogs International, and also the Labrador Retriever Club, Inc.

I volunteer with my dogs at Ronald McDonald House, PARC, The Kidz Club, and HeavenDropt, a non-profit that hires disabled workers to recycle retired military parachutes into consumer products to provide funding for veterans groups. We also compete in AKC and UKC competitions in Conformation, Agility, Rally, Dock Diving, Hunting Retriever Tests, and Obedience.

My first Labrador Retriever came from a Backyard breeder in 1979. She was an oversized great friendly dog with horrendous skin problems. My mother kicked us out of the house, after Pipin destroyed the bathroom because she was bored. I was not a responsible owner for her, but I learned and took care of her. I loved and cried over her when I had to put her down at age 12 because even with Steroid injections, and other medications, I could just not keep her comfortable. Her constant scratching left her miserable, and we could just not control it anymore.

I bred Mako my first well bred Labrador in the early 1990's after finding a local breeder that mentored me in showing and researching pedigrees. All of my current dogs are descended from that dog. It is a line that I have been improving for over 20 years. Since moving to St Petersburg in 2005, I have bred Tuna, twice – the last time in 2008. I kept Flounder from the 1st litter, and Snapper from the 2nd, and the rest were sold on Spay/Neuter contracts, with a rehome clause requiring me to be notified if the dog had to be rehomed for any reason. I now have Cuda , who was sired by Snapper's brother. My dogs have health clearances through the Orthopedic Foundation For Animals for hips, elbows, eyes, and Exercise Induced Collapse (a genetic condition that can cause dogs to collapse under stress)

I am quite aware that The Humane Society of the United States, The ASPCA, and PETA are spearheading mass attacks on dog breeding throughout the United States. Guess Pinellas County has hit the radar. It's just part one of their attack on pets that is disguised as "animal protection." HSUS alone has paid lobbyists in ALL 50 States, using the large number of dogs in shelters, to paint everyone who has ever bred their dog or bought a purebred dog with the same tainted brush. I ask you not to fall for their line.

A responsibly produced puppy does not kill a shelter dog! If someone wants a Labrador Retriever Puppy, they will most likely not "settle" for a mixed breed shelter dog with an unknown background.

I am insulted and offended that this ordinance classifies me in the same manner as the irresponsible people that haphazardly breed their dogs, or don't train or take care of their dogs and then dump them in shelters when they are ill-behaved, or simply inconvenient to keep. There are many Responsible Hobby Breeders in Pinellas County, who carefully select pedigrees, compete with their dogs in a variety of venues, and carefully plan breeding. Those same breeders carefully screen homes, and have contracts that include notifying the breeder if the puppy has to be rehomed for any reason, so the breeder can help place the dog or take it back. Responsible hobby Breeders are not the ones filling the shelters.

I understand that this all sounds very elitist and snobbish - especially to someone who has adopted a shelter dog, or has dedicated their life to rescue. I don't mean it to be. Shelter dogs can be wonderful pets. They can be service dogs, or therapy Dogs, or phenomenal performance dogs. Not everyone spends the time that I do with my dogs. Not everyone cares about performance events or pet therapy, or preserving a breed with a 100+ year history. But if I am going to open my heart and home to a dog, train and take care of that dog, compete with that dog, and make it a member of my family, then I want to have the best chance of having the dog I want to enjoy the things I do. And I want to have that dog to be healthy and have a long life.

There will ALWAYS be a need for healthy, stable, socialized dogs of different breeds. Breeds were developed because certain things require different traits. Just a quick review of Pinellas County Animal Services, Pinellas SPCA, and The Pinellas Humane Society adoptable dogs, shows that 90+ percent of the dogs up for adoption are larger than 20 pounds and a mixed breed. Most are either Pit Bull or AmStaff mixes, which kills me because the bully breeds are WONDERFUL, great tempered dogs when properly bred, and owned by people who understand the breed, but put them in the hands of the wrong person, and you can have a problem. Start mixing with other dogs, and you have a dog that I would have a tough time trusting with my kids. They are tough dogs to adopt, which is why the shelters are full of them.

Buyers look for what they want. If you grew up with Golden Retrievers, then that's what you want. If you travel a lot and want to take your dog with you, or live in a small apartment or retirement community, you want a smaller dog. If you are allergic, you need a hypoallergenic dog with hair, not fur. If you want to do any kind of competition with your dog, knowing the health history of the dog you are getting is very important. These are all reasons why people look for specific breeds.

So where will those people go to find a dog? Will they go to a shelter? No, they will start looking outside the county. They may look on the internet. They may find a reputable breeder and end up with what they want. Or they find the wrong one, because everything looks better on fancy websites, and as happened to a friend of mine, when you travel far enough to get a puppy, and find out that it's not the home you expected, what are you going to do. You're most likely going to be compassionate and get that puppy out of that environment. And in the process, you end up supporting the exact kind of backyard breeding and puppy mills that this ordinance is trying to eliminate, and the dog ends up with behavior or health issues, and you spend the rest of its life dealing with the same problem that you were trying to avoid in the first place.

These changes are fraught with unintended consequences, and most penalize those who are doing the right thing!

If Pinellas County has a problem with overpopulation in shelters, it is NOT being caused by Responsible Hobby Breeders. It is being caused by irresponsible breeders and owners. Please do not lump me and the others who choose to carefully and responsibly breed and place their dogs in the same basket as backyard breeders, and those who are too irresponsible to train, socialize and alter their pets. We are not the same. We are not the problem.

My arguments are as follows. I welcome questions.

The summary of this ordinance says that it is needed because sections of the code need to be "clarified" or "augmented".

1. The existing definition of a pet dealer as having more than 2 litters or 20 puppies per year does NOT need to be changed.
 - a. It will not affect Puppy Mills, or high volume breeders-they are already considered to be Pet Dealers by both Pinellas County AND USDA. So the Pet Dealer ordinance change only affects Responsible Hobby Breeders and backyard breeders.
 - i. Responsible Hobby Breeder would love to get rid of Backyard Breeders. But this ordinance unfairly penalizes RESPONSIBLE HOBBY BREEDERS, who are NOT contributing to dogs in shelters, while Backyard Breeders that are largely responsible for the problem will continue to fly under the radar.

- b. Changes will NOT reduce the number of animals in shelters – I challenge the County and EVERY Shelter in the county to find 10 PUREBRED DOGS in shelters that were bred by Responsible Hobby Breeders. And if you do, I can pretty much guarantee that either the original breeders or a breed rescue would be willing to take them.
- c. Just a quick look at the first 3 pages of websites for adoptable dogs in three Pinellas County Shelters gives this picture...
 - i. SPCA Tampa Bay
 - 1. All mixes (maybe a couple Purebred Pit Bulls)
 - 2. 90% over 20 pounds
 - ii. Humane Society tampa bay
 - 1. All Mixes –
 - 2. 26/27 over 20 Lbs
 - iii. Pinellas County Animal Services.
 - 1. As of 30 days ago (could not get the available for adoption page to come up on Sunday) There appeared to be 1 purebred dog, and the rest mixes, mostly listed as PitBull or Amstaff Mixes.
 - iv. Where are all the dogs from Responsible Hobby breeders? They are NOT in shelters, and are NOT contributing to overpopulation or costing taxpayers money.
- 2. Unintended Consequences – This ordinance will produce serious unintended consequences.
 - a. BYB's will continue to fly below the radar.
 - b. BYB's afraid of "detection" may end up just dumping litters, or euthanizing unwanted puppies at birth
 - c. BYB's may not seek veterinary care for their animals at all
 - d. BYB's and Responsible Hobby Breeders may go outside the county for veterinary care.
 - e. Consumers not being able to find a well-bred, health tested pet locally, which will send them to pet stores the internet and puppy mills, where there is no local support or recourse in case of problems.
 - f. Unfairly restrict Responsible Hobby Breeders who live in areas where having a business is not allowed, from breeding a well-bred, health tested dog.
 - g. Penalize those who are "doing it right" Those who health test their breeding dogs, carefully plan litters, and strive to prove the qualities in their dogs by showing or trialing their dogs should not be penalized because people dump their pets in shelters.
 - h. Dogs do not "breed to a calendar." Even the existing law for 2 litters in a calendar year is not really reasonable, and it's tough to predict how many puppies may be in a litter. You might have a litter of 2 and litters of 12 from the same dog. Sometime when you plan a breeding it doesn't take and there are no puppies. A breeder with several bitches, may have 3 litters in a year, and the next year they may have none.
- 3. Why is this punitive to RESPONSIBLE HOBBY BREEDERS –
 - a. Backyard Breeders are no more likely to buy a pet dealer license than they are to turn themselves in for running a red light.
 - i. Who is going to enforce/police this?
 - b. Purchasing a Pet Dealer License (pay a breeder tax) at a cost of \$150, in addition to paying an extra license fee (Tax) simply for having an unaltered dog. Dogs are Personal Property under the law. Now you want us to be taxed twice for the same dog.
 - c. Responsible Hobby Breeders, would have to pay this fee, even if they DON'T have any planned litters, just to keep on the inspection schedule and in case they DO decide to have a litter. So they would be charged simply for the capability of having a litter, which may never even happen.
 - d. Allow a County inspector in MY HOME once a year. And before renewing the Dealer License. Which needs to be within 2 months of renewal, which the County has Carte Blanche to reject renewal. All for a license that may never even be used.
 - e. May lose the ability to even breed as a hobby, because once the County calls you a Dealer and requires a license, they have redefined what you do. It would then be a business, that could be prohibited in certain areas or communities.

- f. Years ago there was no restriction on breeding your dog. Then it became 2 litters or 20 puppies. Now you want a \$150 fee (tax), PLUS inspections of our HOMES. What will it be tomorrow? Animal Services can set the fee (tax). Animal Services provides the inspectors. Animal Services gets to choose what licenses get renewed. This is unreasonable restriction of my right to enjoy my personal property. Once it starts it does not end until it is too much of a hassle to do and we give up our hobby, or move out of the County.
4. Responsible Hobby Breeders are not making money breeding dogs. They have thousands of dollars invested in breeding programs.
 - a. They have costs for the original purchase of their dog
 - b. Vet fees
 - c. Health clearance screenings
 - d. Training
 - e. Grooming
 - f. Show and trial entries
 - g. Show and Trial travel costs
5. They have hundreds of hours invested in their HOBBY.
 - a. Training
 - b. Research of health and Pedigrees
 - c. Educating the public.
 - d. Screening and educating new puppy homes
6. They carefully screen for the right homes
 - a. Turn down homes that are inappropriate
 - b. Matching families and lifestyles with the personalities and traits of each puppy.
 - c. Show homes on co-own contracts, and only to those experienced in showing, or to someone they can mentor
 - d. Pet homes on Spay/neuter contracts
 - e. ALL puppies with rehome clauses requiring the breeder be notified in the event of a rehome
7. With all costs considered, few, if any come out ahead financially. That is why it is a HOBBY.
 - a. We love our breeds
 - b. We want to improve our breeds
 - c. We want to share the love for our breeds

Please do not hold Responsible Hobby Breeders accountable for the actions of Backyard breeders and irresponsible owners.

I apologize for the length on this, and appreciate your time.
Respectfully,

PK Lichtenberger

RECEIVED
BOARD OF
2016 OCT 10 PM 4:16
BOARD OF COUNTY
COMMISSIONERS
PHOENIX COUNTY FLORIDA

Bachteler, James J

BCC 10-11-16 #6

opposed

From: Linda Larsen <dragonlady2020@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 09, 2016 8:53 PM
To: Justice, Charlie; Long, Janet C; Eggers, Dave; Morroni, John; Seel, Karen; Welch, Kenneth; Gerard, Pat
Subject: proposed animal ordinance changes

Dear County Commissioner:

I am writing to oppose certain changes to the Pinellas County Animal Ordinance, and suggest a minor change to the definition of "Kennel"

I support the rights of Responsible Hobby Breeders to produce healthy, well socialized puppies by occasionally breeding their dogs in Pinellas County. I do not support irresponsible OWNERS, that breed unproven and/or mixed breed dogs with no regard for temperament, ability, or health clearances. (Registration papers are not proof of temperament or ability, and veterinary health certificates are NOT proper health clearances). A perfect recent example of irresponsible OWNERS is an individual has had a dog tied in their backyard for the past 7 years. This dog had never been spayed because it has heartworms. Another dog got her pregnant. The puppies were born when the owner was not home. 2 puppies crawled out of the mother's reach and died in the summer heat. The others survived. They have all been given away at 7 weeks, not 8 weeks as Fl. law states. No matter what laws you pass, this kind of thing is going to continue to happen and our shelters will still be over run with breed unproven and/or mixed breed dogs with no regard for temperament, ability, or health clearances.

I do not support ANY change to the County code that changes the current definition of Pet Dealer, unless that change includes a definition and exemption for Responsible Hobby Breeders, that clearly differentiates them from irresponsible breeders.

I do not support the proposed definition of public nuisance as proposed, as there could be many reasons why a dog might bark for 15 minutes at one time. This definition says nothing about how easily the barking can be heard, nor does it address reason why dogs may bark. If I am not home, and you come and mess around on my property, my dogs will bark at you. If you are near my house doing something unusual, I WANT my dogs to bark at you. I am the first to agree that a dog constantly barking out of sheer boredom is annoying, but I also find contractor noise, children screaming, and lawnmowers running annoying. I'd be willing to bet that if that dog is repeatedly left on its own, it will be barking multiple times a day, and certainly more than twice in a 3 day period. This definition is not reasonable.

Finally, there is a portion of the ordinance that should be changed to encourage more owner-handler dog training, which would REDUCE the number of dogs in shelters, and increase adoption. I would also request that the definition of "kennel" exempt any training facility that trains dogs AND handlers together, provided that that facility does not also board dogs or provide "daycare" services. Well trained dogs are far less likely to end up in shelters, so businesses and training organizations that help people train their dogs actually help reduce the number of shelter pets, and provide a valuable service to the public. Calling these businesses a "kennel" and holding them to care requirements set for kennels is unnecessary, since the dogs are seldom on premises for more than an hour or two, and their owners are always present.

Thank you for your consideration

**Sincerely,
Linda Larsen**

RECEIVED
BOARD OF
216 OCT 10 PM 4:16
SOUTHERN FLORIDA
COMMISSIONERS
PINELLAS COUNTY FLORIDA

Bachteler, James J

BCC 10-11-16 #6

From: Jana Simons <janasimons@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 09, 2016 7:26 PM
To: Justice, Charlie; Long, Janet C; Eggers, Dave; Morroni, John; Seel, Karen; Welch, Kenneth; Gerard, Pat
Subject: Pinellas County Proposed Animal Ordinance

opposed

Dear County Commissioner:

I am writing to oppose certain changes to the Pinellas County Animal Ordinance, and suggest a minor change to the definition of "Kennel"

I support the rights of Responsible Hobby Breeders to produce healthy, well socialized puppies by occasionally breeding their dogs in Pinellas County. I do not support irresponsible OWNERS, that breed unproven and/or mixed breed dogs with no regard for temperament, ability, or health clearances. (Registration papers are not proof of temperament or ability, and veterinary health certificates are NOT proper health clearances).

I do not support ANY change to the County code that changes the current definition of Pet Dealer, unless that change includes a definition and exemption for Responsible Hobby Breeders, that clearly differentiates them from irresponsible breeders.

I do not support the proposed definition of public nuisance as proposed, as there could be many reasons why a dog might bark for 15 minutes at one time. This definition says nothing about how easily the barking can be heard, nor does it address reason why dogs may bark. If I am not home, and you come and mess around on my property, my dogs will bark you. If you are near my house doing something unusual, I WANT my dogs to bark at you. I am the first to agree that a dog constantly barking out of sheer boredom is annoying, but I also find contractor noise, children screaming, and lawnmowers running annoying. I'd be willing to bet that if that dog is repeatedly left on its own, it will be barking multiple times a day, and certainly more than twice in a 3 day period. This definition is not reasonable.

Finally, there is a portion of the ordinance that should be changed to encourage more owner-handler dog training, which would REDUCE the number of dogs in shelters, and increase adoption. I would also request that the definition of "kennel" exempt any training facility that trains dogs AND handlers together, provided that that facility does not also board dogs or provide "daycare" services. Well trained dogs are far less likely to end up in shelters, so businesses and training organizations that help people train their dogs actually help reduce the number of shelter pets, and provide a valuable service to the public. Calling these businesses a "kennel" and holding them to care requirements set for kennels is unnecessary, since the dogs are seldom on premises for more than an hour or two, and their owners are always present.

Thank you for your consideration

Sincerely,

Jana E. Simons
13045 Poinsettia Avenue
Seminole, Florida 33776
(727) 365-4661

RECEIVED
BOARD OF
2016 OCT 10 PM 4:16
CLERK OF COUNTY
PINELLAS COUNTY FLORIDA

Bachteler, James J

BCC 10-11-16 #6

From: Vandenberg, Courtney
Sent: Monday, October 10, 2016 4:20 PM
To: Bachteler, James J
Subject: FW: Changes to the Pinellas Animal Cruelty Ordinance

In forwarding this directly to you I was able to highlight the black color and you can see her text when I highlighted it yellow. Hope this helps!

Courtney Vandenberg

Executive Aide to Commissioner Charlie Justice
Pinellas County Board of County Commissioners
315 Court Street, 5th Floor
Clearwater, Florida 33756
(727) 464-3363 Office
cvandenberg@pinellascounty.org

From: Nina Perino [mailto:luvallbeings@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, October 09, 2016 10:59 AM
To: Eggers, Dave <deggers@co.pinellas.fl.us>; Long, Janet C <JanetCLong@co.pinellas.fl.us>; Seel, Karen <kseel@co.pinellas.fl.us>; Morroni, John <jmorroni@co.pinellas.fl.us>; Gerard, Pat <pgerard@co.pinellas.fl.us>; Welch, Kenneth <kwelch@co.pinellas.fl.us>; Justice, Charlie <cjustice@co.pinellas.fl.us>
Subject: Changes to the Pinellas Animal Cruelty Ordinance

Regarding Sec. 14-29. - Pet Dealerships and Kennels:

Please consider my following concerns/points/suggestions be addressed for an enforceable and meaningful ordinance.

1. Any and all advertising of the sale of dogs and cats via newspaper, internet, etc. shall be required to include the breeder's certification # in the ad. The purpose is two-fold. Breeders would be readily identifiable, enabling enforcement and tracking of allowable first time breeding and the subsequent mandatory spaying after this one time breeding. However, first time breeding permitting/certification requirement would provide the revenue source to implement and carry out the provisions of the ordinance.

2. Regarding the required spaying of the female after a permissible one time, breeding, should not males be neutered, as well, when determining if a person is a breeder? Both male and female dogs should be included in this requirement of allowable one time breeding without a permitting fee penalty.

3. If there is to be no one assigned to check the ads, how would animal services know if a person was a repeat breeder without a permit? I am told that a reader of the ad would have to make the complaint of noncompliance before animal services acted on responding to the violation of the proposed law. Only a purchaser would be reading the ad and would certainly not be knowledgeable about the ordinance or care whether this was an unregistered backyard, repeat breeder.

4. If a person were to breed an offspring of the onetime non-registered bred female, would this constitute another non-certification required breeding situation, or would this person be classified as a breeder? I see loopholes that allow a person to continue breeding, skirting the law.

5. As the proposed law reads now, it is at the breeding of a second litter that the (honest?) breeder has to request a breeder's permit.

The fee for noncompliance (and only if found out) is \$123. This will just be considered the cost of doing business, as the ads in the paper show \$300, \$500, \$1,000 or more per dog. Multiply that by the amount of a single litter. It is a glaring loophole in many ways. Breeders put individual ads in for each breed and there is no way to catch this if they use different phone numbers or even if they use the same phone # and no one is checking.

6. There is no limit on the amount of litters a breeder may breed or sell. This is a biggie, if we are to control overpopulation!!!

7. My proposed suggestion is to require everyone who breeds, to be certified, regardless if this is a first breeding, but excuse the fee for the first litter, if they do not continue breeding and do spay the male and female dog.

Thank you for your time and consideration on this important matter.

Sincerely,

Nina Perino

Megan Ct., Palm Harbor, FL

34684-4630

RECEIVED
BOARD OF
2016 OCT 10 PM 4:23
BOARD OF QUALITY
COMMISSIONERS
PINELAS COUNTY FLORIDA