Attachment A

King County

Department of Executive Services
Records and Licensing Services Division

## Executive Response to King County Council Motion 12871

Motion 12871:

A. The executive is requested to study the feasibility of implementing a dog chaining, tethering and small space confinement ban. The executive is requested to consider the following elements in the feasibility study:

1. Input by the King County Animal Control Officers Guild;
2. Input by the King County sheriff's office;
3. Input by the King County prosecuting attorney's office;
4. Input by the National Animal Control Association;
5. Input by community members, including proponent and opponent perspectives;
6. Cost of implementation;
7. Public education and awareness;
8. Impacts to public health and safety;
9. Humane standards and expectations in King County;
10. Possible implementation in King County's unincorporated areas;
11. Possible implementation in contract cities; and
12. Experiences of jurisdictions that have implemented chaining and tethering bans.

B. A report with findings and recommendations on the feasibility of a chaining, tethering and small space confinement ban should be transmitted to the council for consideration by motion or ordinance by February 28, 2009.

King County

Department of Executive Services
Records and Licensing Services Division

**Executive Response to Council Motion 12871**

## Table of Contents


| | |
|---|---|
| I. Executive summary | Page 3 |
| II. Study Introduction | Page 4 |
| III. Report requirements | Page 5 |
| III.1. Input by Animal Control Officers Guild | Appendix B |
| III.2. Input by Sheriff's Office | Appendix C |
| III.3. Input by Prosecuting Attorney's Office | Appendix D |
| III.4. Input by National Animal Control Association | Appendix E |
| III.5. Input by community members, including proponent, opponent perspectives and impact on dogs | Page 5 |
| III.6. Cost of implementation | Page 10 |
| III.7. Public education and awareness | Page 12 |
| III.8. Impacts to public health and safety | Page 13 |
| III.9. Humane standards and expectations in King County | Page 14 |
| III.10. Possible implementation in unincorporated areas | Page 15 |
| III.11. Possible implementation in contract cities | Page 15 |
| III.12. Experiences of jurisdictions that have implemented chaining and tethering bans | Page 16 |
| IV. Feasibility of Small Space Confinement | Page 18 |
| V. Recommendations on Feasibility | Page 20 |

# I. Executive Summary

More than 100 local jurisdictions and a handful of states, including California, have adopted legislation banning or restricting dog tethering and, in many cases, small space confinement. These jurisdictions include big and small cities and counties in all geographic areas of the United States.

Generally, legislation restricting dog tethering takes three forms: 1) outright ban on dog tethering; 2) restrictions on the methods of dog tethering; 3) time limitations on dog tethering, in either duration or time-of-day.

Jurisdictions around the country have implemented all three versions of dog tethering restrictions, and sometimes combine elements from at least two. The outright ban appears to be the least prevalent, but the easiest to enforce. Time limits based on duration can be the hardest to enforce and the most resource intensive if the duration is more than a few hours.

The experiences of jurisdictions with dog tethering restrictions vary. In some jurisdictions, call volumes for dog tethering enforcement is very high, as many as 30 calls per week. In other jurisdictions, there is not much call activity at all, as few as one or two calls per month. All jurisdictions reported that public education is the key to successful implementation of dog tethering restrictions.

Supporters of anti-tethering legislation include the Humane Society of the United States, the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, and the United States Department of Agriculture. Opponents of dog tethering bans include the American Kennel Club, and sportsmen's organizations such as U.S. Sportsmen's Alliance.

There appears to be a lack of definitive studies on the effects of tethering on the welfare of dogs. We could find only a few studies, and none can be considered definitive. The studies that we were able to find conclude that tethering did not have adverse impacts on the dogs studied. This is in opposition to overwhelming opinion among dog behavior experts, including veterinarians, dog trainers, and animal control officers, that dog tethering does harm dogs.

Supporters argue that dog tethering is cruel to the dogs, causing physical and psychological damage, and is bad for public safety, as tethered dogs are more likely to bite. Opponents argue that tethering per se does not harm the dogs and is a perfectly acceptable confinement method if done properly, and that dog tethering legislation can be difficult to enforce.

Legislation restricting dog tethering appeared in many jurisdictions due to the widespread use of dog tethering in those places. The environmental conditions that tethered dogs were exposed to, such as extreme heat and extreme cold, were also an important factor. Socio-economic factors play a role in the extent of dog tethering in a community, as dog owners with less income are less able to construct fences or kennels to confine their dogs.

Based on the information gathered through this study, we have concluded that legislative action regarding the *continuous* tethering of dogs is warranted. We have concluded that *continuous* dog tethering is not in the best interests of the animals in our community or public safety. However, we have not concluded that all tethering is bad, or that tethering is inherently harmful to dogs.

Dog tethering is present in King County, but it does not appear to be widespread, although in some areas, it is more prevalent. Extreme weather factors are not as important in King County, but the socio-economic pattern does appear to hold here as the areas with the most tethering appear to be those with the lowest income levels.

We believe it is feasible to restrict dog tethering methods and times, but allow for tethering in some situations, including when the owner is present, and when a proper pulley system is used. We are recommending time limitations on dog tethering that are related to specific time periods of the day, such as 9 p.m. to 5 a.m., and not duration. Time limitations based on duration are difficult to enforce.

We also recommend including a correctional grace period which allows violators 30 days to get into compliance before penalties are levied.

We have concluded that the least feasible option is to enact a complete ban on dog tethering and small space confinement, due to several factors, including the lack of conclusive studies on the effects of dog tethering, and the socio-economic factors in King County. We believe a dog tethering ban could be in conflict with the county's Equity and Social Justice Initiative.

While we have concluded that enacting restrictions on dog tethering is feasible, it will have an impact on animal control call volumes, which will increase. Animal Care and Control is currently not resourced to respond to all low priority calls in a timely manner, and adding another call type will exacerbate this situation.

The recommended method for restricting tethering is to make amendments to King County's animal cruelty codes (K.C.C. 11.04.250).

# II. Study Introduction

For the purposes of common understanding, the definition of dog tethering for this study is as described on the Humane Society of the United States website:

> ***1. What is meant by "chaining" or "tethering" dogs?***
>
> *These terms refer to the practice of fastening a dog to a stationary object or stake, usually in the owner's backyard, as a means of keeping the animal under control. These terms do not refer to the periods when an animal is walked on a leash.*

Motion 12871 required that the County Executive gather input from the King County Prosecutor, the King County Sheriff, the National Animal Control Association, the

Animal Control Officers Guild, and others. Each of the named organizations or individuals was offered the opportunity for input through email. In addition, the general public was offered the chance to provide input on this subject via the King County Animal Care and Control website. All of the input that was received from the general public is presented in its entirety in Appendix G.

# III. Specific Report Requirements of Motion 2008-0347

Motion 12871 specifically requested that the Executive consider 12 elements in this feasibility study. Below are individual responses to each. In the case of the input from specific organizations, the submittals are included in an appendix.

## 1. Input by the King County Animal Control Officers Guild

Please see Appendix B which includes the input from ACOG in its entirety.

## 2. Input by the King County Sheriff's oOffice

Please see Appendix C which includes the input from the Sheriff in its entirety.

## 3. Input by the King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office

Please see Appendix D which includes the input from the Prosecuting Attorney in its entirety.

## 4. Input by the National Animal Control Association

Please see Appendix E which includes the input from NACA in its entirety.

## 5. Input by community members, including proponent and opponent perspectives

Please see Appendix F which includes input from the community.

### A. Opponents of restrictions

Groups or individuals that are opposed to bans or restrictions on dog tethering argue that there is no definitive evidence that tethering in itself is abusive or creates aggressive dogs. While supporters of tethering restrictions state that this practice is inhumane and damaging to the dogs, there are no definitive studies to confirm this, opponents argue. They also believe that tethering is an acceptable and necessary means of confinement in a number of circumstances, including agricultural and recreational. Some groups opposed to bans on dog tethering also argue that a ban does not take into account economic conditions for low-income dog owners. Fences or kennels can be expensive and not everyone can afford them, while tethering is an inexpensive form of dog confinement.

Organizations that have come out in opposition to bans on dog tethering may support specific restrictions on dog tethering, but not outright bans. For example, agricultural or ranching groups may oppose tethering legislation if there are no exemptions for dogs working in their respective industries.

One of the most well-known of the organizations that has made statements opposed to dog tethering bans is the American Kennel Club (AKC) . The following statements can be found on the AKC website:

*"AKC recognizes that under certain circumstances, responsible tethering is an appropriate method of containing a dog. As many of these bills severely restrict a dog owner's right to responsibly tether an animal, many constituents have contacted AKC regarding how best to respond to and oppose these proposals."*

*"With substantive animal cruelty statutes already in place, states and local governments need to enforce existing law in cruel tethering cases. Irresponsible owners who are not providing humane treatment for their animals can and should be prosecuted under current law. The already-existing cruelty laws make these proposed tethering bans or restrictions unnecessary."*

*"North Carolina is not alone in its attempt to intervene unnecessarily with tethering as a useful tool for confining dogs. Bills similar to North Carolina's have been introduced in Maine, Maryland, New York, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia. (The proposals in Rhode Island and Virginia have been effectively quashed in committee.)*

*AKC encourages concerned fanciers and dog owners to work with their legislators to ensure that laws make appropriate allowances for responsible tethering."*

(The North Carolina bill referenced in the AKC statement restricts stationary tethering to a maximum of 3 hours a day, and tethering on a trolley system to 6 hours a day.)

Other opponents of dog tethering restrictions have been statewide or local dog clubs. A vocal opponent of the dog tethering restrictions passed in the State of California included an organization called The Animal Council, which defines itself as a "California Non-Profit Public Benefit Corporation." Here is an excerpt from a statement that The Animal Council made in opposition to SB 1578 in California:

*"Anti-tethering laws have become popular based on the fiction that tethering is abusive and creates dangerously aggressive dogs. Inappropriate or inhumane instances are already addressed by existing law including local tethering laws in urban areas and Penal Code 597t at the state level and other cruelty provisions when applicable. These other local and state laws apply when tethering is associated with instances of*

*harmful or injurious equipment, lack of care or shelter or dangerous dog behavior. In fact, some of these laws have been far more narrowly drafted than SB 1578 to address only inappropriate equipment use such as heavy metal chains of size, length and/or weight disproportionate to the individual dog. Improperly done in combination with other uncontrolled and/or unrecognized stimuli to dogs' natural drives to defend themselves within confined in a limited area, tethering can set up dangerous defensive behavior in some dogs but does not cause "aggressive" behavior per se. For example, a fearful tethered dog is unable to escape a provocative person or other animal and may bite in a defensive rather than aggressive manner. However, some dogs may require tethering in addition to fencing in for safe containment in some circumstances. These other existing local and state laws apply when tethering is associated with instances of harmful or injurious equipment, lack of care or shelter or dangerous dog behavior and are adequate."*

## B. Supporters of restrictions

Groups or individuals that advocate nationally against dog tethering have been working with local advocates to pass legislation throughout the country. These advocates argue that dog tethering restrictions are necessary and justified because continuous or unrestricted tethering is cruel to the dogs and puts the public at greater risk for animal bites from dogs, either because the dogs have become aggressive due to tethering, or because when a dog is confined only by tether, there is no barrier to prevent a person or another animal from coming into contact with the dog, as there is when a dog is confined by fence ***(this public safety justification is addressed below under heading #8)***.

The number of animal welfare organizations and agencies that support legislative action restricting tethering includes many established animal welfare groups and the United States government. Here are some of the most prominent organizations and agencies that have come out in support of restrictions or bans on dog tethering:

- American Humane
- ASPCA (American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals)
- Dogs Deserve Better
- HSUS (Humane Society of the United States)
- PETA (People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals)
- Unchain Your Dog
- United States Department of Agriculture

## C. Impacts on the dogs

The theory that tethering is cruel to the dog is based on the principle that dogs are social pack animals. Statements to this effect can be found on many animal welfare websites, including the HSUS website:

*"Dogs are naturally social beings who thrive on interaction with human beings and other animals. A dog kept chained in one spot for hours, days, months or even years suffers immense psychological damage. An otherwise friendly and docile dog, when kept continuously chained, becomes neurotic, unhappy, anxious and often aggressive."*

Other organizations have made similar statements regarding the effects on dogs from tethering. Notably, the United States Department of Agriculture is one of these organizations. On July 2, 1996, the USDA issued the following statement in the *Federal Register* regarding dog tethering:

*"Our experience in enforcing the Animal Welfare Act has led us to conclude that continuous confinement of dogs by a tether is inhumane. A tether significantly restricts a dog's movement. A tether can also become tangled around or hooked on the dog's shelter structure or other objects, further restricting the dog's movement and potentially causing injury."*

In 1997, the USDA ruled that individuals and organizations regulated by the Animal Welfare Act cannot keep dogs continuously chained. At that time, the USDA issued the following statement:

*"The dog-tethering rule is designed to prevent the practice of permanently tethering dogs and not allowing them proper exercise as specified under the Animal Welfare Act."*

Notwithstanding statements such as those above, we have been unable to find a definitive study on dog tethering to fully support them. Such a study may exist, but we were unable to locate it, and the organizations that we contacted for assistance, including ASPCA, HSUS, Dogs Deserve Better, are not aware of one either.

However, with the help of the ASPCA, we were able to locate a study in the **Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science** titled *"A Comparison of Tethering and Pen Confinement of Dogs."* This study compared general activity and specific behaviors of 30 adult Alaskan sled dogs. The study used activity level and stereotypic behaviors as indicators of animal welfare. The purpose of the study was to determine whether tethering was detrimental to the dog's welfare.

The study concluded that:
*"Although tethering is intuitively less acceptable, the fact the dogs rarely pulled at their chains and the lack of major differences in behavior indicate that tethering may be an acceptable alternative housing method, but this may depend on the breed and experience of the dog. Our findings provide no evidence that tethering was any more or less detrimental to dog welfare than being housed in pens (as recommended by the USDA). Definite recommendations regarding the use of pens and tethers require further experimental trials in which environmental and prior experience can be better controlled than in this study."*

Opponents of laws restricting dog tethering have referred to this study in making their case. However, while this study could be helpful in informing the discussion, it would be difficult to make general statements regarding dog tethering based on this study given the small sample size, the use of just one breed, and other factors as noted by the authors themselves. One of these factors is that the dogs in the study had been tethered for years prior to being housed in pens. Another factor is that the dogs actually had less space to move around in the pens as opposed to on the tether (the space provided by the tether was almost seven times as large). One reason that the dogs in the study did not fare worse in the pens could have been that the pens were so small.

We also located a book, *"Handbook of Applied Dog Behavior and Training"* (2005), by Steven R. Lindsay that references studies that included tethering. Lindsay writes in the book:

*"Although keeping a dog continuously on a chain appears to exert a potent agitating effect – as Shaw (1906) says, "The chain makes a dog savage" – the results of a study performed by Le Boeuf (1967) in which dogs were periodically staked out and exposed to the approach of free-moving male and female dogs do not support the notion that chaining per se makes dogs more aggressive. Occasional and brief tethering outdoors is unlikely to produce adverse welfare effects or alter aggression levels, but the quality-of-life degradation, agitation, frustration, lack of gratifying social contact, and entrapment associated with excessive and routine chaining and penning of dogs outdoors may significantly increase a dog's aggressive propensities."*

In addition to Lindsay's writing and the results of *"A Comparison of Tethering and Pen Confinement of Dogs,"* we have the expertise of the individuals and organizations on both sides of the issue. Many of these individuals are educated or trained on animal behavior, such as veterinarians, and/or they work with dogs as part of their profession, such as dog trainers and animal control officers, so their expertise should not be discounted.

Aside from the psychological impacts of tethering on dogs, there is evidence of the physical effects from chaining or tethering. Abrasive injuries can occur to the dog's neck, and these injuries can become infected. A dog that lives on a short tether for extended periods also may lack proper exercise. And, tethers frequently become entangled, preventing the dog from reaching food, water, or shelter. In some cases, dogs have hanged themselves on tethers.

## 6. Cost of Implementation

The overall cost of implementation would depend heavily on the type of dog tethering restrictions approved.

King County currently responds to animal control complaints called in by citizens. King County Animal Care and Control does not have the resources to perform significant enforcement not related to citizen calls given the current call volumes. King County is able to perform animal control enforcement beyond citizen calls when an animal control officer is driving between calls, observes something while on another call, or through Enhanced Services Contracts with suburban cities. Suburban cities hire King County for enhanced services for several reasons, one of which is to perform specific types of enforcement such as park patrols, and off leash violations, etc.

If King County were to enforce dog tethering restrictions via patrols, the cost could increase significantly. King County could consider adding additional animal control officers to patrol neighborhoods looking for dog tethering violations, as opposed to responding to complaints, and perform community-based outreach work to discourage dog tethering that is occurring outside the approved restrictions.

Even without patrols, King County Animal Care and Control would incur additional costs as the agency will receive additional calls for service to respond to complaints about dog tethering. King County currently receives complaints about dog tethering, but they are not coded as such since tethering isn't illegal, and are typically investigated as animal cruelty complaints.

To be responsive to calls regarding dog tethering violations, Animal Care and Control would create a priority ranking system for these call types, from the high priority calls in which cruelty or health and safety may be concerns, to the lower priority calls that may not even be violations of the tethering laws.

Many jurisdictions that have already implemented dog tethering restrictions did so in part as a reaction to the number of dogs that were tethered in their community. In some communities, the number of dogs that were tethered is quite high.

Angie Bahnke, the Dog Tethering Program Officer in Austin, Texas, reported that her animal control agency was initially overwhelmed by the number of complaints that came in from citizens when that city's dog tethering ban was implemented in October 2007 (see Appendix A for the text of Austin's ordinance). Bahnke reported that in the first few weeks after implementation, animal control was handling more than 100 calls related to tethered dogs each week. Bahnke reported that the agency is now averaging about 30 calls per week. The volume of calls in Austin seems to indicate that dog tethering is widespread in that community (population 680,899).

In contrast, San Francisco Animal Care and Control Officer Eleanor Sadler reported that her agency receives only a couple of calls that are tethering specific each *month*. San Francisco has a population of 776,733.

It is difficult to estimate precisely how extensive dog tethering is in King County. For this report, we conducted a word search through the Animal Care and Control

complaint system to gain some insights into the number of animal cruelty cases and dog bite cases in which dog tethering may have been involved.

Here are the results of a word search for this report:

- In 2008, Animal Care and Control received 984 animal cruelty calls. Of those 984, tethering was noted in six cases. T he word "tied" was noted in another 49, making a total of 55 cases with either word in the case or call comments. That is 5.5 percent of the animal cruelty cases. In 2007, 1,027 cruelty calls came in. Tethering was noted in seven cases, while the word "tied" was found in another 68, making a total of 75 cases with either word in the case comments or call comments. That is 7.3 percent of the animal cruelty cases.
- The word search through the bite case reports in the data base turned up only a few results – in 2008, one case with the word "tether" and one case with the words "chain" or "tied." That was out of 393 total bite cases for 2008. In 2007, no cases with "tether" were found and 8 cases with "chain" or "tied." That was out of 371 cases in 2007.

Information gathered from King County Animal Control Officers indicates that there is dog tethering throughout King County, in the rural areas and in the cities, but that it does not appear to be pervasive. Nonetheless, King County Animal Control officers report that in several communities, including White Center and Skyway, there is a high incidence of dog tethering.

The King County Animal Control Sergeant in charge of animal cruelty investigations, Sergeant David Morris, does not believe that dog tethering is a pervasive problem in King County.

Susan Hartland, a Washington State representative for Dogs Deserve Better, said dog tethering is less widespread in King County than other counties in Washington State.

It is difficult to predict what the increase in the number of calls would be with a new dog tethering law. As more and more citizens have become aware of the animal cruelty laws and what animal cruelty is, the number of cruelty calls received by Animal Care and Control has increased significantly. In 2000, King County received 566 calls regarding animal cruelty. In, 2008, the number was 984, which was down from 1,027 in 2007.

It is almost certain that there are many more dog owners in King County that are tethering their pets than there are citizens committing acts of animal cruelty as currently defined by state, county or city law. However, it is impossible to predict how many citizens would report neighbors for tethering if that became an option.

The number of calls being experienced in Austin is likely higher than what would occur in King County, as tethering is widespread in that community. However, the experience in Tucson, Arizona could be an appropriate comparison. Animal control authorities there receive 4 to 5 calls per week, according to Field

Supervisor Jose Chavez (please see Appendix A for the text of Tucson's ordinance). Tucson's population is 486,699, about 42 percent the size of King County's. One variable is that Tucson's dog tethering ordinance has been in place for 13 years, while King County's would be new. Call volumes are typically higher after implementation, and slow down in subsequent years.

Taking into account the experiences in other jurisdictions and conditions in King County, we estimate that the number of calls regarding dog tethering in the first year of implementation would be approximately 700, or two per day. This number may prove to be too low or too high. Depending on the type of legislation that is passed, dog tethering calls could be labor intensive from an enforcement perspective.

The addition of one Animal Control Officer for dog tethering, along with a vehicle and equipment, would be justified for effective enforcement and community awareness. And as noted below in #7, a budget for public awareness may be required (please see Appendix H for a sample public awareness budget).

Another potential cost could be a fund created to help low-income citizens pay for fencing (such a fund has been created by community groups in Austin). However, the cost of this program element could be completely funded by community members, and not King County.

An additional potential cost could be more animals relinquished to the shelter if dog owners can not comply with the new regulations and decide to give up their animal instead.

## 7. Public Education and Awareness

It would be difficult to determine what level of public education and awareness currently exists in the community regarding dog tethering. However, based on public education and awareness regarding other animal control matters, one could presume the public has some knowledge on this subject. This appears to be supported by the number of citizens that provided input through the Animal Care and Control website. A total of 213 responses were received for this dog tethering study via the King County Animal Care and Control website.

If a dog tethering ban was implemented, public education and awareness would be important to the success of the measure. Every jurisdiction that we spoke with about their dog tethering laws emphasized this element as necessary for a successful implementation plan, as citizens need to understand first that there is a new law, what the new law is, and how they can comply. A particular emphasis should be focused on low-income areas of the county where dog owners may have more difficulty affording other methods of confining their dog.

Due to the controversial nature of an ordinance restricting dog tethering, a great deal of media coverage would be expected of the council's enactment and Animal Care and Control's implementation of tethering restrictions. This media coverage would help with public education and awareness of the issue. Some paid media

also would be needed, and could take the form of print (newspaper), radio, television, or outdoor (billboards and buses).

Nonetheless, there are segments of the population that do not regularly read, listen to, or watch the media. For these groups, a community-based education/awareness campaign would be needed. Collateral materials (brochures, postcards, etc.) would be necessary and a budget for getting them to citizens (by mail, in-person). King County could use existing resources for some of this delivery, such as other mailings (pet license renewal forms), and other existing outreach venues such as pet license canvassers, booths at various community events. The speed at which the community is made of aware of the new dog tethering restrictions would be directly related to the budget for outreach. If there is trouble identifying a budget, the county may want to phase in enforcement of the dog tethering restrictions with some sort of amnesty period, as word will get out slowly.

Please see Appendix H for a sample public awareness budget.

## 8. Impacts to Public Health and Safety

Those that support dog tethering restrictions argue that public health and safety is greatly improved by them, and there are studies that seem to support this contention. The King County Sheriff agrees. Public health and safety would be improved the most by a total ban on dog tethering, as that is the strongest method for helping to ensure that people, particularly children or other animals, do not stray into the territory of a tethered dog.

A number of studies have been conducted on dog bites by a variety of organizations, including the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). These studies are frequently cited by supporters of dog tethering restrictions because they demonstrate an increased potential for dog bites from dogs that are tethered.

One study, *"Which Dogs Bite? A Case-Control Study of Risk Factors,"* was published in 1994 in **Pediatrics,** a peer-reviewed medical journal. This study, which looked at 178 biting dogs and matched controls in Denver, is often referred to by supporters of tethering restrictions as showing that a chained dog is almost three times more likely to bite than an unchained dog. It is true that the study results showed a 2.8 odds ratio for chained dogs to bite. Meaning a chained dog is 2.8 times more likely to bite than an unchained dog. However, the odds ratio of 2.8 had a confidence interval of 1.0 to 8.1, meaning that the finding was of borderline statistical significance. An odds ratio of 1.0 means there is no statistical difference in risk between the comparison groups. A larger number of dogs would have been needed in the study to determine if the risk level observed (2.8) was a true estimate of the increased risk of a chained dog biting compared to a non-chained dog. One drawback of this study is that it looked only at dog bites to a non-household member, whereas many bites are inflicted upon people living in the same household as the dog.

The authors of the study write:
*"Our finding that being chained in the yard may be a risk factor for biting is in agreement with prior studies which have demonstrated that chained dogs account for a substantial proportion of serious and fatal bites. A dog may be chained as the result of having exhibited aggressive behavior which itself may be a risk factor for biting, rather than chaining somehow causing a dog to bite. One measure of aggressive behavior may be growling or snapping at a visitor to the house. Our results, however, showed no significant difference in this behavior for dogs chained while in the yard and those not chained, suggesting that chaining was not likely to have been the result of aggressive behavior."*

In one sense, whether or not the tethering causes the dog to become aggressive and therefore bite may not be relevant. The results of the study suggested that chained dogs are more likely to bite. It could be because there is no fence to prevent either a person, frequently a child, from getting too close to the tethered dog, or prevent the dog from getting too close to the person. It could be because the dog was already aggressive and the owner put it out on a tether to keep it away from family members. It could also be because a dog responded to an external factor according to its fight or flight instinct – i.e., since they are chained and can't take flight, they fight, or bite.

Another study published in the **Journal of the American Medical Association,** *"Dog Bite-Related Fatalities From 1979 Through 1988,"* documents the relationship between dog tethering and fatal dog attacks. This study notes that for pet-related deaths among victims one year of age and older with circumstances documented (50 total cases), 28 percent resulted from a child who wandered too close to a chained dog. However, the same study also notes that 36 percent of the cases – a higher number -- resulted from a child gaining unauthorized access to a fenced yard where a dog was kept.

An additional study *"Fatal Dog Attacks, 1989-1994"* was published in **Pediatrics** and found similar results. Of the deaths of children age 1 through 9 years old with documented circumstances (38 total cases), 29 percent resulted from a child wandering too close to a chained dog.

## 9. Humane Standards and Expectations in King County

Based on the overall support for animal cruelty laws in King County, it is fair to assume that the community has high standards for the humane care of animals. In addition, the large number of citizens that turned out for the council's community meeting on Animal Care and Control in April 2008 could be seen as a sign that the community has expectations that animals will receive humane care. Another indicator of the humane standard and expectations is the number of citizens who provided input for this report via the Animal Care and Control website. A total of 213 responses were received. Of those, 185 clicked the yes button indicating that they support restrictions on dog tethering. Only 19 clicked the no button, and some of those appear to have misunderstood what they were clicking, as their written comments indicate support for restrictions.

Notwithstanding these indicators, it would be difficult to definitively state the humane standards and expectations of King County citizens without conducting some sort of poll or focus group. If the decision was made to pursue dog tethering restrictions, the council could decide to hold public meetings to gauge the public's expectations to gather additional data.

In several of the jurisdictions that have enacted dog tethering restrictions, the effort was launched by a local group created and dedicated to that cause. In many of these cases, the anti-dog tethering group formed in response to a case in which dog tethering resulted in a particularly bad outcome for a dog or person, or both. It could have been a disturbing animal cruelty case, or a disturbing bite case.

One reason this study came about was because the Washington State representatives for Dogs Deserve Better approached King County Council members on this subject. While the effort in King County may have been launched by Dogs Deserve Better, it was not in response to a high-profile case of dog tethering that had a particularly bad outcome and captured the attention of the community. It was based on the organization's overall goal of improving animal cruelty laws and conditions for dogs, according to Hartland.

## 10. Possible implementation in King County's Unincorporated Areas

Implementing the law would be easier in the unincorporated areas as opposed to the cities, as King County is the local government in these areas. In some of the urban unincorporated areas, particularly White Center and Skyway, implementation would likely be resource-intensive, as Animal Control Officers report that there is a significant amount of dog tethering occurring there. Animal Control Officers report that tethering is occurring in the rural areas, as well, but not to the same degree as White Center and Skyway. Nonetheless, travel times to rural areas consume large amounts of officers' time.

It is recommended that any implementation in unincorporated areas should start with a public education campaign, then an amnesty period, then a ramp-up to full implementation.

## 11. Possible implementation in contract cities

Most of the jurisdictions that contract with King County for animal control services have adopted the King County Code by reference. For these jurisdictions, changes that are made to the King County Code are automatically and simultaneously made to their city codes (a total of 32 cities contract with King County for animal control services - of those, 23 have adopted the King County Code by reference).

For the cities that have not adopted the code by reference, their city councils would have to specifically add the new tethering law to their city codes.

In either case, significant outreach would need to be done with all contract cities throughout the review, adoption and implementation process. This would be a significant change in animal care and control law, and each city should have to opportunity for input and the right of refusal.

Any initial restrictions on dog tethering could be drafted so they apply only to unincorporated areas, and would not automatically be law in cities that have adopted the King County Code by reference.

## 12. Experiences of jurisdictions that have implemented chaining and tethering bans

More than 100 jurisdictions across the country have implemented restrictions or bans on dog tethering. They have come about for a number of reasons.

Weather conditions have played a prominent role in many jurisdictions in which dog tethering restrictions have been implemented. In places like Arizona and Texas, one concern has been exposure to the heat. In other places, a concern is over the cold. In some places, like Kansas, the concern is over both – heat in the summer, and cold in the winter.

In other cases, dog tethering restrictions were brought about due to the pervasiveness of dog tethering in a community.

With such a large number of jurisdictions approving restrictions, a significant variance in the legislation is present as a number of means, methods, and exemptions have been incorporated into the legislation around the country.

In general, however, there are three basic models for dog tethering restrictions: 1) outright ban on dog tethering 2) restrictions on the methods used to tether; and, 3) time limits on dog tethering. These basic models are not mutually exclusive, and many jurisdictions have pulled from one or more of the approaches to craft their ordinance.

In the majority of jurisdictions (if not all), the penalty for illegal dog tethering, absent other factors, is a misdemeanor.

### A. Jurisdictional Survey

We talked with several jurisdictions that have implemented bans or restrictions on dog tethering. Here is a sampling of information from five of them.

**Austin, Texas**

The City of Austin has implemented a ban on dog tethering. Austin/Travis County Animal Protection and Control Tethering Officer Angie Bahnke reported that dog tethering is a significant problem in Austin. Bahnke said animal control authorities in Austin are receiving about 30 calls per week

related to dog tethering, and that is down from 100 calls a week after the dog tethering ban was implemented in October 2007. Bahnke strongly encouraged a robust educational period prior to implementation of a ban, in addition to a grace period. If King County chooses to enact an ordinance that restricts methods or sets time limits, Bahnke suggested that the restrictions be very specific, particularly on what types of trolley systems would be allowed. Bahnke said trolley system restrictions can be confusing to citizens.

**Multnomah County, Oregon**

Multnomah County has implemented legislation restricting the duration of dog tethering to no more than 10 hours in a 24-hour period. Multnomah County Animal Services Chief Field Supervisor Chuck Poetz reported that it is hard to predict exactly how widespread dog tethering is in Multnomah County. Poetz said MCAS issued less than 10 citations for dog tethering in 2008 and receives about 20 calls per year related to dog tethering. If there was a complete ban on dog tethering instead of the current time limitation, Poetz predicted there would be many more calls than there currently are. The 10-hours in a 24-hour period limit on dog tethering has been difficult to enforce, Poetz said. This is mostly because it is difficult to prove the dog was tethered for the 10 hours. Animal Control officers do not have the time to sit and watch, and neighbors typically do not, either.

**San Francisco, California**

San Francisco Animal Care and Control enforces the state law regarding dog tethering and a city code. The state law limits tethering to not more than three hours in a 24-hour period. The state law allows a running line, pulley, or trolley system. The state law also makes exceptions for tethering associated with recreational areas, herding, or agricultural activities. San Francisco Animal Care and Control Officer (SFACC) Eleanor Sadler reported that dog tethering is not a significant problem in that city. SFACC receives very few calls that are tethering specific, just one or two each month. Because of the small volume of calls, SFACC is able to enforce the three-hour time limit on tethering, Sadler said. SFACC does allow trolley or pulley systems if approved by the agency.

**Topeka, Kansas**

The City of Topeka Code restricts dog tethering to not more than one continuous hour, or up to three hours per day as long as there is a three-hour break between each hour of tethering. The code also disallows tethering when the weather is too hot or too cold, unless the dog has access to shade or shelter. In addition, Topeka bans tethering in an area where the earth is bare and no steps have been taken to prevent the surface from becoming wet and muddy if it rains. This provision may have relevance to King County considering the number of days it rains here.

Topeka Animal Control Manager Linda Halford reported that historically, there has been a high amount of dog tethering in that city, and it continues to be a problem. Halford said the number of calls that came in after the city approved the dog tethering restrictions was on average one or two per day. The call volume slowed down in 2006 and 2007, but has picked up again in the last six months to about one call per day. Halford reported no problems in enforcing Topeka's dog tethering ordinance because of the clause mandating a three hour break. Halford said this allows animal control officers to note their time of arrival for the call, and return three hours later (or less). If the dog is on a tether, the officer knows there was not a three-hour break. Halford strongly encouraged a significant educational period prior to implementation of dog tethering restrictions, in addition to a grace period at the outset of implementation. Halford said one of the primary reasons for the creation of the dog tethering restrictions in Topeka was the number of dog bites by tethered dogs.

**Tucson, Arizona**

The City of Tucson has a complete ban on dog tethering. Pima County provides animal care and control services to the City of Tucson. Pima County Animal Care Center (PACC) Field Supervisor Jose Chavez reported that dog tethering was a significant issue in Tucson prior to the adoption of the dog tethering ban 13 years ago. PACC still receives a steady flow of complaints about dog tethering in Tucson, but it is now about 15 to 20 a month.

# IV. Feasibility of Small Space Confinement Ban

Outdoor small space confinement will likely surface as an issue if the council adopts tethering restrictions as some dog owners that make changes to comply with the new legislation will construct outdoor dog kennels as an alternative to tethering.

Approaches to legislating confinement sizes vary, but there is some consistency in the allowed dimensions of the confinement spaces. Many of the jurisdictions set the size at 150 square feet per animal, including Austin, Texas, and Fairhope, Alabama. Others set the size at 100 square feel per animal, including San Bernadino, California, and Grand Prairie, Texas. All require additional space for additional animals. Another approach is to mandate the space size depending on the size of the dog.

The following recommendations for confinement space can be found on the HSUS website:

| Number of Dogs | Under 50 lbs. | Over 50 lbs. |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 6x10 (60 sq. feet) | 8x10 (80 sq. feet) |
| 2 | 8x10 (80 sq. feet) | 8x12 (96 sq. feet) |
| 3 | 8x12 (96 sq. feet) | 10x14 (140 sq. feet) |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 4 | 10x12 (120 sq. feet) | 12x16 (192 sq. feet) |

Here are some examples of small space confinement restrictions (copied from the jurisdiction's on-line code postings):

**San Bernardino, California**
*Dog kennels must be tall enough to prevent the dog from jumping over or have a secure top and be able to prevent dogs from digging out. Kennels must have a minimum of 100 square feet for one dog, plus an additional 25 square feet for each additional dog in the same enclosure.*

**Fairhope, Alabama**
*Any dogs confined within a fenced yard must have an adequate space for exercise based on a dimension of at least one hundred and fifty (150) square feet per dog.*

**Grand Prairie, Texas**
*Sec. 522.Confinement.*
*(a) Any dogs confined within a fenced yard must have adequate space for exercise based on a dimension of at least one hundred (100) square feet for one dog, plus an additional thirty (30) square feet for each additional dog.*
*(b) For owners or persons having custody of a dog kept in an outside dog run or dog kennel, the enclosure shall meet the one hundred (100) square foot requirement for the first dog with an additional 30 square feet for every additional dog in the same enclosure.*

**Frederick County, Maryland**
*(4) Any dog confined within an outdoor enclosure must have adequate space for exercise. A minimum of 100 square feet is required. Dogs over 75 pounds must have an additional 50 square feet. Seventy-five square feet is required for each additional dog kept within the same enclosed area.*

**Austin, Texas**
*(B) An outdoor enclosure used as the primary living area for a dog or used as an area for a dog to regularly eat, sleep, drink, and eliminate must have at least 150 square feet of space for each dog six months of age or older.*

# V. RECOMMENDATIONS ON FEASIBILITY

## 1. Considerations

Serious consideration must be given to several factors in deciding what shape any legislative action should take. These factors include:

- **Socio-economic**
  The experiences of other jurisdictions and our own experiences in King County have established that socio-economic conditions play a significant role in opinions about dog tethering and the extent of dog tethering in a particular community.

For example, dog tethering is more widespread in lower income areas with citizens that have the fewest resources to build kennels or fences for confinement.

- **Current Conditions**
  Dog tethering bans or restrictions have been adopted in many jurisdictions because the practice was so widespread. In other places, they were adopted based on the public sentiment regarding the treatment of animals. The jurisdictions with the most tethering usually have the most stringent laws, typically an outright ban. While dog tethering is present in King County, we have seen no evidence that it is widespread.
- **Environmental Conditions**
  Weather conditions – particularly extreme heat and cold -- played a large role in the adoption of dog tethering bans or restrictions in other jurisdictions. These extreme weather conditions are not present in King County.
- **Ability to Enforce**
  It goes without saying that dog tethering legislation is more successful the easier it is to enforce. Tethering laws, or any laws, that are hard to enforce, don't get enforced consistently.
- **Impacts on Animal Care and Control**
  There will be increased call volumes if tethering restrictions are to be enforced properly.

## 2. Tethering Model Alternatives

| Model 1: Outright ban on dog tethering: | Potential strengths of outright ban on dog tethering: | Potential weaknesses of outright ban on dog tethering: |
|---|---|---|
| This approach is pretty straight forward – dog tethering is simply not allowed. This approach appears to be the least prevalent of the three, but it was the approach used by what is thought to be the first jurisdiction to pass anti-tethering legislation, Maumelle, Arkansas. An outright ban is used in counties, such as Cobb County, Georgia, and cities, including New Orleans, Tucson, Austin, and Irving, Texas. | A primary strength of an outright ban is if you believe that tethering is inherently cruel or results in decreased public safety, it is simply not allowed in your community. There are no exemptions that some believe minimize the impacts on dogs from tethering. And from a public safety perspective, this is the strongest model for preventing dog bites, as some sort of fencing – a kennel or yard fence - is required if the dog is off-leash and in the yard.<br><br>From an enforcement perspective, an outright ban in many ways is easier to enforce – the dog is either tethered, or it isn't. The enforcement officer doesn't have to worry about proving that a pet owner exceeded the time limitations. The officer doesn't have to measure the length of the tether or the weight of the chain. If a dog is being tethered, it is a violation. | A primary weakness would be the opposite of the primary strength - that there are no exceptions. This would be especially true for members of the community who do not feel that tethering is inherently cruel, particularly if certain conditions are met. One condition, for example, is if a dog owner tethered the dog on a "trolley" system, which is allowed in many jurisdictions. The tether is hooked to a line above the ground so the dog is not tethered to one spot, but can move back and forth along the line. Another example would be if the dog owner only tethered the dog for an hour or two to go to the grocery store.<br><br>Opponents of outright bans also argue that this method does not take into account economic conditions – that there are some members of the community that may not be able to afford a fence to confine their dog. Tethering, with restrictions or without, is an inexpensive means of dog confinement. Being forced to construct a yard fence or dog run may force some dog owners to relinquish their pet due to economic hardship. Officer Bahnke from Austin reported that some pet owners there have relinquished their dogs based on their inability |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | to afford a fence. And this is in a community that has resources available through the Austin Dog Fence Fund to help pay for fencing.<br><br>A number of people involved in the dog tethering issue, even those who support dog tethering restrictions, believe that a confinement method incorporating a proper trolley system is acceptable. A dog on a proper trolley system has much more room to roam and is not stuck in the same small radius surrounding a stake or post. Most observers will acknowledge that a trolley system is not as good as a fence from a safety perspective. Others will say that it still may not address the need for social interaction between the dog and the owner. However, even with a fence for confinement, there is no guarantee that the owner is going to provide the dog with the social interaction that the animal desires.<br><br>A number of individuals also believe that dog tethering for limited time periods is acceptable because the dog has the opportunity to be freed from the chain every day. For those with this perspective, a primary concern is *continuous* tethering in which the dog is always on a tether, with no hope for anything else. People that find time limits as an acceptable solution believe it helps nullify the negative effects of continuous |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | tethering. It does not, however, address all the safety issues associated with tethering. |
| **Model 2: Restrictions on the methods of tethering:** | **Potential strengths of restrictions on methods of tethering:** | **Potential weaknesses of restrictions on methods of tethering:** |
| Under this model, the object is to create a set of restrictions or allowed exemptions that counteract or nullify the negative effects of tethering on the dog, and allow for special circumstances. This is a fairly common approach used by many jurisdictions around the country, including Montgomery County, San Francisco, Little Rock, and Kansas City.<br><br>The restrictions or exemptions are typically very specific and can cover all elements of the dog tethering system.<br><br>**Restrictions include:**<br>Training chains, choke chains, or pinch chains can not be used as collars.<br>Buckle-type collars or a body harness is okay.<br>The tether has to be a certain length. Some jurisdictions set a length, such as ten feet, while others require a calculation based on the size of the dog, such as five times the length of the dog's body.<br>The tether/chain can not surpass a certain weight. | This model allows some tethering if done in a way that supporters and authorities believe will mitigate or negate the harm done to the dog, and it allows tethering in specific circumstances. This model does take into account economic factors - for some jurisdictions, that means allowing tethering with a trolley system. Trolley systems are relatively inexpensive, and they provide the dog more room to explore. This model also allows tethering when the owner is outside with the dog, allowing the owner to take the dog outside when gardening or doing yard work, even if they don't have a fence.<br><br>Though not as easy to enforce as a ban, if the restrictions are straight forward and easy to understand, this model can still present a manageable enforcement scenario. | For those that believe any tethering is bad, this model allows some tethering. In particular, this model allows a trolley system. With a trolley system, the dog is still tethered; it just has more room to roam around and exercise and is not stuck in a very small space. This model does not address the public safety issue of having no actual barrier (fence) for the dog.<br><br>Model 2 can be harder to enforce because there will be more gray area, depending on the restrictions. The trolley system can be difficult to explain to citizens. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| In most cases, this is calculated as a fraction of the dog's weight, such as 1/8 of the dog's weight.<br>The tether must be free of tangles and can not strangle or entangle the dog.<br>The dog can not be tethered during periods of extreme weather, including heat, cold, hurricanes, thunderstorms, and tornadoes.<br>Puppies (dogs under six months of age), can not be tethered at all.<br>The tethered dog can not be sick or injured.<br>The dog must have access to water, shelter, and dry ground.<br><br>**Exemptions**<br>If the dog is in visual range of the pet owner.<br>Tethering is allowed with a pulley, running line, or trolley system. There are requirements for the components of these systems, including the length of the running line, the height of the running line, and the length of the attaching tether.<br>Tethering is allowed if required in a camping or recreational area.<br>Tethering is allowed for a period of time that the owner needs to complete a temporary task.<br>Tethering is allowed if directly related to the business of shepherding or herding.<br>Tethering is allowed if | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| directly related to the business of cultivating agricultural products if is it necessary for safety of the dog. | | |
| **Model 3: Time limits on tethering.** | **Potential strengths of time limits on tethering.** | **Potential weaknesses of time limits on tethering.** |
| Time limits can take two forms -- restrictions on the times of the day dogs can be tethered, or the length of time a dog can be tethered. Some jurisdictions combine the two.<br><br>There are many examples of time limits on dog tethering. Here are a few samples, copied from the jurisdiction's on-line code postings:<br><br>**Kern County, California**<br>*(a) A dog or puppy shall not be restrained by a fixed point chain or tether for more than twelve (12) consecutive hours in a twenty-four (24) hour period.*<br><br>**Denver, Colorado**<br>*Cruelty to animals prohibited. (b) It shall specifically be cruel, dangerous or inhumane for any person to: (3) Tether and leave, or permit to be left, unattended any animal on a leash, cord or chain of less than six feet in length for longer than one hour.*<br><br>**Fort Lauderdale, Florida**<br>*b. It shall be unlawful for any person who owns or any person who is in charge or* | This model allows some tethering, but there are limits on either the duration of the tethering, or the times of day in which the tethering is allowed. Supporters believe the time limitations will mitigate or negate the harm done to the dog. This model also takes into account the economic factor as it allows tethering if conditions and time limits are met.<br><br>If the time limits take the form of times of the day in which tethering is not allowed, enforcement is manageable and can result in successful prosecution. If the duration of the time limits is short enough, enforcement can be manageable. The longer the duration, the more difficult it is to prove, and more time has to be spent investigating and documenting, using more resources. | For those who believe any tethering is bad, this model allows some tethering. And it allows tethering without a trolley system as long as time limits are observed. This model does not address the public safety issue of having no actual barrier (fence) for the dog.<br><br>If the time limits are in the form of duration, enforcement can be difficult, depending on the length of the duration. A longer duration (more hours) can be harder to enforce. The enforcement officer must prove that the dog owner exceeded the time limits, such as 12 hours in a day. This typically will require some kind of visual evidence from a neighbor, such as video, or an affidavit. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *in control of any dog that is over the age of six (6) months to tie, chain, or otherwise tether a dog outdoors between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. except that a dog of any age may be temporarily tethered, tied, or chained outdoors for a total time period not exceeding fifteen (15) minutes.*<br><br>**Bloomington, Indiana**<br>*(i) It shall be unlawful for the owner/guardian/colony caretaker of any animal to keep or maintain the animal on a tether for a period of more than ten continuous hours and no more than twelve hours in any twenty-four hour period, or for any duration under conditions, which threaten the health, or well-being of the animal.*<br><br>**Indianapolis, Indiana**<br>*(c) It shall be unlawful for any animal to be tethered between the hours of 11:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m.;*<br><br>**Topeka, Kansas**<br>*(b) No person shall:*<br>*(1) Continuously tether a dog for more than one (1) continuous hour, except that tethering of the same dog may resume after a hiatus of three (3) continuous hours, for up to three (3) hours total time on tether per day; provided that for the purpose of tethering a dog, a chain, leash, rope or tether shall be at least ten (10) feet in length;* | | |

## 3. General Recommendations

Based on the information gathered through this study, we have concluded it is feasible to adopt legislative action regarding the *continuous* tethering of dogs. We have concluded that *continuous* dog tethering is not in the best interests of the animals in our community or public safety. However, we have not concluded that all tethering is bad, or that tethering is inherently harmful to dogs.

We believe it is feasible to restrict dog tethering methods and times, but allow for tethering in some situations, including when the owner is present, and when a proper pulley system is used. We are recommending time limitations on dog tethering that are related to specific time periods of the day, such as 9 p.m. to 5 a.m., and not duration.

We also recommend including a correctional grace period which allows violators 30 days to get into compliance before penalties are levied.

We have concluded that the least feasible option is to enact a complete ban on dog tethering and small space confinement, due to several factors, including the lack of conclusive studies on the effects of dog tethering, and the socio-economic factors in King County. We believe an outright dog tethering ban could be in conflict with the county's Equity and Social Justice Initiative.

While we have concluded that enacting restrictions on dog tethering is feasible, it will have an impact on animal control call volumes, which will increase.

The recommended method for restricting tethering is to make amendments to King County's animal cruelty codes (K.C.C. 11.04.250).

## 4. Legislation Recommendations

Here are the elements recommended for legislation regarding dog tethering and small space confinement:

### A. Public Awareness and Education

If approved by the council, there should be a period of time focused on public education about the ordinance change before enforcement occurs. This time period should be at least 120 days to allow Animal Care and Control time to assemble a public education plan, including time to prepare informational materials to be distributed to the community in coordination with other public education efforts to save money. Other jurisdictions have had extensive public education campaigns ahead of implementation, including Topeka, Kansas, which had a 90 day period. This public education plan may need an appropriate budget (see Appendix H for a sample public awareness budget).

### B. Correctional Grace Period

Any ordinance approved by the council should, at least initially, contain a provision that would allow violators a short time period to get into compliance without facing a penalty. We are recommending that period be 30 days. Animal Control Officers would still be responding to complaints and rectifying animal

welfare or public safety situations, but they would not be levying fines unless violators do not get into compliance within this grace period. Other jurisdictions have this grace period written into their laws, such as Frederick County, Maryland.

**C. Violation would be misdemeanor**
Violations of the tethering restrictions only would be classified as a misdemeanor.

**D. Initial ordinance could apply only to unincorporated areas unless contract cities specifically wish to be included**
Due to the significant change represented by an ordinance restricting dog tethering, it could be written in a way that exempts contract cities that have adopted the King County Code by reference, unless those cities specifically wish to be included.

**E. Outdoor Small Space Confinement**
Outdoor small space confinement should be addressed as a change to the zoning code. The recommended approach for outdoor dog kennels, based on our review of other jurisdictions, is: 100 square feet per animal under 75 pounds, and 150 square feet per animal over 75 pounds. An additional 50 square feet of space should be added for each additional dog.

**F. Restrictions on dog tethering methods and times**
Recommended restrictions on dog tethering are:

<u>Restrictions on methods</u>
- Training chains, choke chains, or pinch chains can not be used as collars. Buckle-type collars or a body harness is okay.
- The tether must be five times the length of the dog's body.
- The tether/chain can not be heavier than 1/8 of the dog's weight.
- The tether must be free of tangles and can not strangle or entangle the dog.
- The dog can not be tethered during periods of extreme weather, including heat, cold, and windstorms.
- Puppies (dogs under six months of age), can not be tethered.
- The tethered dog can not be sick or injured.
- The dog must have access to water, shelter, and dry ground.

<u>Exemptions</u>
- Tethering is allowed if the dog is in visual range of the pet owner, and other restrictions are observed.
- Tethering is allowed with a pulley, running line, or trolley system. The height of the running line can be no higher than eight feet, and the length of the attaching tether must be 15 feet.
- Tethering is allowed if required in a camping or recreational area.
- Tethering is allowed if directly related to the business of shepherding or herding.

- Tethering is allowed if directly related to the business of cultivating agricultural products if is it necessary for safety of the dog.

Time limitations

- Dog tethering, except as exempt, is not allowed between the hours of 9 p.m. and 5 a.m.

# Executive Response Council Motion 2008-0347

# APPENDICES


| Appendix | Title | Page |
|---|---|---|
| Appendix A | Sample Ordinances | Page 2 |
| Appendix B | Animal Control Officers Guild Input | Page 8 |
| Appendix C | King County Sheriff's Office Input | Page 17 |
| Appendix D | King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office Input | Page 19 |
| Appendix E | National Animal Control Association Input | Page 22 |
| Appendix F | Proponents and Opponents Input | Page 23 |
| Appendix G | Public Input (See separate Appendix G) | Page 44 |
| Appendix H | Sample Public Awareness Plan/Budget | Page 45 |

# Appendix A (sample ordinances)

**East Longmeadow, Massachusetts**

***9.025 Prolonged Confinement of Dogs Outside***

*(A) Prolonged Chaining or Tethering of Dogs is Prohibited. No person owning or keeping a dog in the town shall chain or tether a dog to a stationary object including but not limited to any structure, dog house, pole or tree for longer than six total hours in any twenty-four hour period. Nothing in this section shall be construed as prohibiting a person from walking a dog on a hand-held leash.*

*(B) Permissible Outside Confinement. A person owning or keeping a dog in the town may confine such dog outside for longer than six total hours in a twenty-four hour period through the used of any of the following three methods:*

*(1) A pen or secure enclosure, if the following conditions are met: (a) The pen or secure enclosure has adequate space for exercise with a dimension of at least one-hundred square feet. Commercial dog kennels with pens intended for the temporary boarding of dogs are exempt from this requirement. (b) The pen or secure enclosure is constructed with chain link or other similar material as determined by the Building Inspector, with all four sides enclosed.*

*(2) A fully fenced or otherwise securely enclosed yard wherein a dog has the ability to run but is unable to leave the enclosed yard.*

*(3) A trolley system or a tether attached to a pulley on a cable run, if the following conditions are met:*

*(a) Only one dog may be tethered to each cable run.*

*b) The tether must be attached to a properly fitting collar or harness worn by the dog, with enough room between the collar and the dog's throat through which two adult fingers may fit. Choke collars and pinch collars are prohibited for the purposes of tethering a dog to a cable run.*

*(c) There must be a swivel on at least one end of the tether to minimize tangling of the tether.*

*(d) The tether and cable run must be at least ten feet in length and mounted at least four feet but not more than seven feet above ground level.*

*(e) The length of the tether from the cable run to the dog's collar or harness must allow continuous access to water and appropriate shelter as described in paragraph (C) of this by-law. The trolley system or tether must be of appropriate configuration to confine the dog to the owner's property, to prevent the trolley system or tether from extending over an object or an edge that could result in injury or strangulation of the dog; and to prevent the trolley system or tether from becoming tangled with other objects or animals.*

*(C) Access to Water and Shelter. Any person owning or keeping a dog in the town confined outside in accordance with Paragraph (B) of this section must provide the dog with access to water and an appropriate dog shelter. The dog shelter must allow the dog to remain dry and protected from the elements. Such shelter shall be fully enclosed on three sides, roofed, and have a solid floor. The entrance to the shelter shall be flexile to allow the dog's entry and exit, and sturdy enough to block entry of wind and rain. The shelter shall be small enough to retain the dog's body heat and large enough to allow the dog to stand and turn comfortably. The enclosure shall be structurally sound and in good repair. Suitable drainage must be provided so that water is not standing in or around the shelter.*

*(D) No Outside Confinement at Night. No person owning or keeping a dog in the town may leave a dog chained, tethered or confined outside between the hours of 11:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m.*

*(E) Hazardous Weather Conditions. The Dog Officer shall determine if weather conditions are hazardous to a particular dog or dogs chained, tethered or confined outside in accordance with Paragraphs (A) or (B) of this section. Upon such determination, the Dog Officer shall order the owner or keeper of the dog to provide the dog with immediate access to an approved area. The failure of the owner or keeper of a dog to provide access to an approved area pursuant to the Dog officer's Order shall constitute a violation of this section.*
*(F) Consequences of Violation. A violation of this section shall be punishable by a written warning for the first offense. Subsequent offenses shall be punishable by a fine of one hundred dollars ($100.00) each, and the Dog Officer and/or his assistant shall have the authority to impound and confine the dog in accordance with Paragraph (G) of this section. In addition to the above described procedures, the provisions of this section may also be enforced by the Dog Officer or any police officer of this town, by non-criminal complaint.*

**North Little Rock, Arkansas**
*Sec. 10-41. Dog pens confinement.*
*a. Dog pens. Unless otherwise permitted under subsection d, outdoor dog pens shall be located 75 feet from any dwelling other than the person owning or controlling the dog. There shall be at least 150 square feet in such pen for each dog kept therein which is over six months of age.*
*b. Tethering. Unless otherwise permitted under subsections c and d, it shall be unlawful for any person to tether a dog to any inanimate object as a means of confinement.*
*c. Trolley Systems. A trolley system is a method to confine a dog by tethering the dog to a cable that is no less than ten (10) feet in length and elevated four (4) to seven (7) feet off the ground in a manner that allows the tether to move freely along the length of the cable. Unless otherwise permitted under subsection d, it shall be unlawful for any person to confine a dog through the use of a trolley system:*
*(1) Between the hours of 8:00 pm and 6:00 am.;*
*(2) That is located within 75 feet from any dwelling other than the person owning or controlling the dog; or*
*(3) In a manner that poses harm to the dog including, without limitation:*
*A. The use of a collar or harness that is ill-fitting or constructed of any material other than leather or nylon;*
*B. The use of a tether that exceeds 25% of the body weight of the dog; or*
*C. The use of a trolley system in an area that contains hazards to the dog or deprives the dog of food, water, or shelter.*
*d. Permit. The Director of the North Little Rock Animal Shelter is hereby authorized to issue permits to allow the confinement of a dog in a manner that would otherwise be prohibited by this section.*
*(1) Criteria. No permit shall be issued unless the Director determines that: (i) unusual circumstances warrant confinement of the dog in this manner; (ii) the welfare of the dog will not be harmed by the confinement; and (iii) the neighborhood will not be adversely impacted by the confinement.*
*(2) Inspection. All permits issued under this subsection shall require consent to both scheduled and unscheduled inspections of the animal and confinement area.*
*(3) Revocation. The Director shall revoke a permit issued under this subsection if: (i) the holder of the permit is convicted of any offense under local, state, or federal law involving animal cruelty; or (ii) an inspection indicates that the criteria authorizing the permit are no longer met.*
*e. Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit walking dogs with a hand-held leash.*

**Miami, Florida**

*(b) It shall be unlawful for a responsible party to tether the dog while outdoors, except when all of the following conditions are met:*
*(1) The dog is in visual range of the responsible party, and the responsible party is located outside with the dog.*
*(2) The tether is connected to the dog by a buckle-type collar or a body harness made of nylon or leather, not less than one inch in width.*
*(3) The tether has the following properties: it is at least five times the length of the dog's body, as measured from the tip of the nose to the base of the tail; it terminates at both ends with a swivel; it does not weigh more than 1/8 of the dog's weight; and it is free of tangles.*
*(4) The dog is tethered in such a manner as to prevent injury, strangulation, or entanglement.*
*(5) The dog is not outside during a period of extreme weather, including without limitation extreme heat or near-freezing temperatures, thunderstorms, tornadoes, tropical storms, or hurricanes.*
*(6) The dog has access to water, shelter, and dry ground.*
*(7) The dog is at least six (6) months of age. Puppies shall not be tethered.*
*(8) The dog is not sick or injured.*
*(9) Pulley, running line, or trolley systems are at least 15 feet in length and are less than 7 feet above the ground.*
*(10) If there are multiple dogs, each dog is tethered separately.*

***Austin, Texas***
***3-4-2 RESTRAINT REQUIREMENTS FOR DOGS ON PRIVATE PROPERTY.***

*(A) Except as provided in Subsection (B), a person may not restrain a dog with a chain or tether unless the person is holding the chain or tether.*

*(B) The prohibition of Subsection (A) does not apply to a temporary restraint:*

*(1) during a lawful animal event, veterinary treatment, grooming, training, or law enforcement activity; or*

*(2) that is required to protect the safety or welfare of a person or the dog, if the dog's owner or handler remains with the dog throughout the period of restraint.*

*(C) A person restraining a dog with a chain or tether shall attach the chain or tether to a properly fitting collar or harness worn by the dog. A person may not wrap a chain or tether directly around a dog's neck. A person may not restrain a dog with a chain or tether that weighs more than 1/18 of the dog's body weight. A chain or tether used to restrain a dog must, by design and placement, be unlikely to become entangled.*

*(D) A person may not restrain a dog in a manner that does not allow the dog to have access to necessary shelter and water.*

*(E) A person may not restrain a dog in a manner that allows the dog to move outside the person's property.*

*(F) A person may not keep six or more dogs, other than puppies less than six months old, unless the dogs are kept in an enclosure that meets the requirements prescribed by Section 3-2-13 (Enclosure for Dogs).*

**Multnomah County, Oregon**

*(14) Except as provided under MCC 13.300(B) (2), permit any dog to be tethered for more than 10 hours in a 24-hour period.*
*(15) Notwithstanding MCC 13.305 (B) (14), permit any dog to be tethered in a manner or method that allows the animal to become entangled for a period of time detrimental to the animal's well being.*

*(13.300 (B) (2) Within the open bed of any moving pickup, flat-bed or similar vehicle, unless the dog is cross-tethered or protected by framework, carrier or other device sufficient to keep it from falling from the vehicle.)*

**San Francisco, California**

State of California Code:

*122335. (a) For purposes of this chapter, the following terms shall have the following definitions:*

*(1) "Animal control" means the municipal or county animal control agency or any other entity responsible for enforcing animal-related laws.*

*(2) "Agricultural operation" means an activity that is necessary for the commercial growing and harvesting of crops or the raising of livestock or poultry.*

*(3) "Person" means any individual, partnership, corporation, organization, trade or professional association, firm, limited liability company, joint venture, association, trust, estate, or any other legal entity, and any officer, member, shareholder, director, employee, agent, or representative thereof.*

*(4) "Reasonable period" means a period of time not to exceed three hours in a 24-hour period, or a time that is otherwise approved by animal control.*

*(b) No person shall tether, fasten, chain, tie, or restrain a dog, or cause a dog to be tethered, fastened, chained, tied, or restrained, to a dog house, tree, fence, or any other stationary object.*

*(c) Notwithstanding subdivision (b), a person may do any of the following in accordance with Section 597t of the Penal Code:*

*(1) Attach a dog to a running line, pulley, or trolley system. A dog shall not be tethered to the running line, pulley, or trolley system by means of a choke collar or pinch collar.*

*(2) Tether, fasten, chain, tie, or otherwise restrain a dog pursuant to the requirements of a camping or recreational area.*

*(3) Tether, fasten, chain, or tie a dog no longer than is necessary for the person to complete a temporary task that requires the dog to be restrained for a reasonable period.*

*(4) Tether, fasten, chain, or tie a dog while engaged in, or actively training for, an activity that is conducted pursuant to a valid license issued by the State of California if the activity for which the license is issued is associated with the use or presence of a dog. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to prohibit a person from restraining a dog while participating in activities or using accommodations that are reasonably associated with the licensed activity.*

*(5) Tether, fasten, chain, or tie a dog while actively engaged in any of the following:*

*(A) Conduct that is directly related to the business of shepherding or herding cattle or livestock.*

*(B) Conduct that is directly related to the business of cultivating agricultural products, if the restraint is reasonably necessary for the safety of the dog.*

*(d) A person who violates this chapter is guilty of an infraction or a misdemeanor.*

*(1) An infraction under this chapter is punishable upon conviction by a fine of up to two hundred fifty dollars ($250) as to each dog with respect to which a violation occurs.*

*(2) A misdemeanor under this chapter is punishable upon conviction by a fine of up to one thousand dollars ($1,000) as to each dog with respect to which a violation occurs, or imprisonment in a county jail for not more than six months, or both.*

*(3) Notwithstanding subdivision (d), animal control may issue a correction warning to a person who violates this chapter, requiring the owner to correct the violation, in lieu of an infraction or misdemeanor, unless the violation endangers the health or safety of the animal, the animal has been wounded as a result of the violation, or a correction warning has previously been issued to the individual.*

*(e) Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to prohibit a person from walking a dog with a hand-held leash.*

City of San Francisco Code:

*4. CONFINEMENT REQUIREMENTS*

*Though highly discouraged, tethering is only acceptable if:*

*A. The tether is attached to a stake in the ground with a pulley like system.*

*B. The tether is attached to the dog by a non-choke type collar or body harness at least 10 feet in length which would allow the dog access to food, water and shelter, but free of obstructions.*

**Topeka, Kansas**

*5) (a) Attach chains or other tethers, restraints or implements directly to a dog without the proper use of a collar, harness, or other device designed for that purpose and made from a material that prevents injury to the animal.*

*(b) No person shall:*

*(1) Continuously tether a dog for more than one (1) continuous hour, except that tethering of the same dog may resume after a hiatus of three (3) continuous hours, for up to three (3) hours total time on tether per day; provided that for the purpose of tethering a dog, a chain, leash, rope or tether shall be at least ten (10) feet in length; or*

*(2) Use a tether or any assembly or attachments thereto to tether a dog that shall weigh more than one-eighth ( 1/8) of the animal's body weight, or due to weight, inhibit the free movement of the animal within the area tethered; or*

*(3) Tether a dog on a choke chain or in such a manner as to cause injury, strangulation, or entanglement of the dog on fences, trees, or other man made or natural obstacles; or*

*(4) Tether a dog without access to shade when sunlight is likely to cause overheating, or appropriate shelter to provide insulation and protection against cold and dampness when the atmospheric temperature falls below forty (40) degrees Fahrenheit, or to tether a dog without securing its water supply so that it cannot be tipped over by the tether; or*

*(5) Tether a dog in an open area where it can be teased by persons or an open area that does not provide the dog protection form attack by other animals; or*

*(6) Tether an animal in an area where bare earth is present and no steps have been taken to prevent the surface from becoming wet and muddy in the event of precipitation.*

*(c) The following definitions apply to words used in this section:*

*(1) When used as a verb, "tether" or "tethering" shall mean fastening a dog to a stationary object, pulley run line or a stake.*

*(2) When used as a noun, "tether" or "tethers" shall mean a chain, leash, rope, cable, chain, string, leather or nylon strap, or any other material used to fasten a dog to a stationary object, pulley run line or a stake.*

**Tucson, Arizona**

*(e) That the animal is given adequate exercise space as follows:*

*(1) Within an enclosure that shall be constructed of material, and in a manner, to minimize the risk of injury to the animal, and shall encompass sufficient usable space to keep the animal in good condition;*

*(2) Tieouts are prohibited.*

*(3) Temporary tethering for horses is exempt from the provisions of Tucson Code, subsection 4-3(2)(e)(2).*

# Appendix B (input from Animal Control Officers Guild)

Animal Control Officer's Guild
Ban on Continuous Chaining
King County Motion 2008-0347

Sergeant John J. Diel Jr. – President
Officer Shelby Russell-Diaz – 1st Vice-President
Sergeant David Morris – Secretary-Treasurer
Officer Chelsea Eykel – Legislative Lead

Animal Control Officer's Guild
Kent, Washington
February 19, 2009
Executive Summary

King County Council Motion 2008-0347 requires the executive to study the feasibility of implementing a ban on continuous dog chaining, tethering and small space confinement and report findings and recommendations to the King County Council.

The Executive has requested input from the Animal Control Officer's Guild.

As a rule, the Animal Control Officer's Guild does not endorse unrelieved and/or continuous chaining or tethering. However, certain factors may make alternatives cost prohibitive and/or cause an adverse socio-economic impact on citizens of King County. The current economic crisis could be a deterrent to implementation resulting in costly expenditures to the citizens of King County. In addition, a ban on chaining can result in an increase population of dogs into the shelters potentially increasing euthanasia.

The Guild will focus on the existing animal cruelty statutes to determine sufficient statutory tools are in place to address this issue. In reference to vicious dog/dangerous dog appropriate statutes are in place in both the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) and the King County Code (KCC).

In reviewing the feasibility of implementing a ban on continuous dog chaining, tethering and small space confinement it is important to first define the terms and then evaluate existing laws and determine if King County is already equipped with the appropriate enforcement tools to effectively administer to those specific elements.

Whether you agree or disagree with chaining or tethering, it is not by itself considered cruel by definition. This is usually a symptom in a cruelty case where a dog is tied out in an area without adequate food, water, shelter and sanitation.

Currently, KCACC has several enforcement options in its arsenal which are used often and historically have been very effective. These include education, Notice of Violation, Notice and Order and Criminal.

If the legislative body goes forward with a chaining ordinance it would be prudent to conduct an analysis of status-quo staffing compared to the staffing necessary to meet the increase requests of the public to administer the anticipated increase in service requests.

The Guild does not believe the result of a Chaining/Tethering Ordinance will significantly reduce the number of vicious dog and bite incidents reported to KCACC. The proposed ordinance will also not have a significant impact on cruelty complaints. As stated above, chaining is secondary to allegations of abuse of an animal.

An outright ban will be easier to enforce, but will have adverse impact on the citizens of King County. If the County decides a ban is the way to go it is important to consider exceptions. Status-quo is the least invasive and most fiscally sound option.

Animal Control Officer's Guild
Ban on Continuous Chaining
King County Motion 2008-0347

**Policy and Purpose**

**Motion 2008-0347** requires the executive to study the feasibility of implementing a ban on continuous dog chaining, tethering and small space confinement and report findings and recommendations to the King County Council.

The Executive has requested input from the Animal Control Officer's Guild.

**Authority**

King County Code-Title 11: Animal Control
http://www.kingcounty.gov/council/legislation/kc_code.aspx

King County Council Ordinance 2007-0284, Motion 2007-0283 and 2007-0105
http://www.metrokc.gov/council/news/2007/0507/JP_LP_BF_animals.htm

King County Ordinance 15801
http://mkcclegisearch.metrokc.gov/detailreport/?key=7632

King County Motion 2008-0347

**Analysis**

Ideally, as a rule the Animal Control Officer's Guild does not endorse unrelieved and/or continuous chaining or tethering. However, certain factors may make alternatives cost prohibitive and/or cause an adverse socio-economic impact on citizens of King County. These factors include but are not limited to, the costs of confining their pet by purchasing/building an outside kennel or fence in order to confine a dog or dogs.

In addition, enforcement of a ban on continuous chaining can result in an increase in impounds of dogs to the shelters. If you are from the opinion chained dogs result in vicious dogs, you will understand euthanasia is the most likely result if the owner does not redeem. Consider the fact a dog can become protective at the end of a leash out on a walk with its owner.

For the purposes of this discussion the Guild will focus on the existing animal cruelty statutes to determine sufficient statutory tools are in place to address this issue. In reference to vicious dog/dangerous dog appropriate statutes are in place in both the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) and the King County Code (KCC). Currently, there are no statutes against having a vicious dog confined on your property per se, only if your dog gets loose and violates existing laws can action be taken ie: trespass, bite, vicious propensities, dangerous dog declaration, violation of notice and order (civil) etc. The RCW provides for a dog owner to be liable if his/her dog bites another person on its own property as well as on public property. Dogs can potentially break away from a tether which can result in a public safety issue, but dogs also jump or dig out from under fences.

In this report the Guild will not discuss opinions of other groups related to chaining since the Motion specifically requested input from specific organizations. Due to the time constraints this cannot be considered a comprehensive evaluation, but raises specific issues to be considered in making an ultimate decision on this matter.

**Definitions**

In reviewing the feasibility of implementing a ban on continuous dog chaining, tethering and small space confinement it is important to first define the terms and then evaluate existing laws and determine if King County is already equipped with the appropriate enforcement tools to effectively administer to those specific elements.

The Random House Dictionary (2006) defines continuous as uninterrupted in time; without cessation (par 1). In order to understand the intent of any 'continuous dog chaining' language, professionals will look to the statute for the legislative definition giving appropriate guidance to determine probable cause to initiate action. If the legislative body goes forward with a chaining ordinance it would be prudent to include a length of continuous time necessary to establish a violation. If an owner does not have a fence and wants to allow their dog to relieve itself and exercise in the yard, would there be a maximum amount of time the dog could be allowed to be tethered and not be in violation?

The Random House Dictionary (2006) defines tethering as:

a. a rope, chain, or similar restraint for holding an animal in place, allowing a short radius in which it can move about.

b. a similar ropelike restraint used as a safety measure, especially for young children and astronauts. (par. 1-2)

In order to understand the intent of any 'tethering' language, professionals will look to the statute for the legislative definition giving appropriate guidance to determine probable cause to initiate action. If the legislative body goes forward with a chaining ordinance it would be prudent to include when and if tethering is allowed for any period of time in order to establish a violation. Again, if an owner does not have a fence and wants to allow their dog to relieve itself and exercise in the yard, would there be a maximum amount of time the dog could be allowed to be tethered and not be in violation? In addition, like the definition provides, some would consider tethering a safety measure, both for the safety of the public and for the safety of the dog. Dogs have been known to jump and/or dig under fences. Also consider whether an overhead pulley type tether is an adequate alternative with a certain radius and length of mobility.

The Random House Dictionary (2006) defines a small space confinement as of limited size; of comparatively restricted dimensions; not big; little (par. 1). In order to understand the intent of any 'small space confinement' language, professionals will look to the statute for the legislative definition giving appropriate guidance to determine probable cause to initiate action. If the legislative body goes forward with a chaining ordinance it would be prudent to include dimensions of small space confinement in order to establish a violation. Both the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) and the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) give guidance on minimum standards of kennel/confinement depending on the size of your dog.

| HSUS - Kennel Size Guidelines (1998, pg. 2) | | | USDA - Animal Welfare Act (2003,pg.49) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Small Dogs | 3' x 4' | 12 square feet | (c) *Additional requirements for dogs—* |
| Medium Dogs | 4' x 5' | 20 square feet | (1) *Space.* (i) Each dog housed in a primary |
| Large Dogs | 4' x 6' | 24 square feet | enclosure (including weaned puppies) must be provided a minimum amount of floor space, calculated as follows: Find the mathematical square of the sum of the length of the dog in inches (measured from the tip of its nose to the base of its tail) plus 6 inches; then divide the product by 144. The calculation is: (length of dog in inches + 6) □(length of dog in inches + 6) = required floor space in square inches. Required floor space in inches/ 144 = required floor space in square feet. |

## Cruelty Statutes

Whether you agree or disagree with chaining or tethering, it is not by itself considered cruel by definition. This is usually a symptom in a cruelty case where a dog is tied out in an area without adequate food, water, shelter and sanitation. Often times a dog is tethered or chained on a very short lead or the dog has managed to tangle the tie-out in such a manner it does not have adequate space, cannot get to food, water or shelter and in unsanitary conditions. Taking guidance from the KCC and the RCW (see appendix) in order for cruelty to be present the suspect dog owner has to have the required state of mind and the corresponding act:

| State of Mind | Corresponding Act |
|---|---|
| • Willfully<br>• Cruelly<br>• Intentionally<br>• Neglectfully<br>• Recklessly<br>• Causes<br>• Criminal Negligence<br>• Allow | • Injure<br>• Kill<br>• Fright or Pain<br>• Suffering<br>• Fail or Neglect to Aid<br>• Fail to Alleviate Pain, Suffering or Injury<br>• Inflicts Unjustifiable Substantial Pain<br>• Physical Injury<br>• Starves, Dehydrates or Suffocates<br>• Considerable Suffering or Death |

According to the RCW (2007, par. 4) it is an affirmative defense of Animal Cruelty in the 2nd Degree if by the preponderance of the evidence defendant's failure was due to economic distress beyond the defendant's control.

One can argue a suspect could be found guilty for Cruelty in the 1st degree for intentionally causing physical injury if a dog sustains a severe injury around its neck while tethered in its backyard. One can conclude the suspect tethered the dog for a continuous period of time and as a result the collar embedded into the neck causing a laceration. The suspect did intend to tether his dog and it did cause physical injury. In this case the cruelty statute would be the appropriate enforcement tool to charge the suspect of a crime.

## Enforcement

Currently, KCACC has several enforcement options in its arsenal which are used often and historically have been very effective. The majority of the calls require an educational contact. This is used when a suspect is very close to violating a rule, law or policy and will benefit from the Officer giving them information and guidance on what is required to improve care ie: provide blankets, crate train, keep in garage while at work, purchase license. This can be enhanced by a public awareness campaign on King County Civic Television and other media outlets, including the Web.

If KCACC determines the contact requires a higher level of enforcement a Notice of Violation (NOV) can be issued. An NOV puts the suspect on notice there is a complaint or the Officer observed they are in violation of a State, County or Municipal statute and they need to correct it or an elevated enforcement action will be taken ie: dog at large and not under control, need to provide adequate shelter, leash law, licensing, vicious propensities, trespass.

KCACC has a Notice and Order (N/O) civil process used for repeat offenders and/or cases reaching the highest level of civil enforcement, but not necessarily at the level of a criminal matter. The most common are N/O of confinement and N/O of Removal. Repeat trespassing cases, bites and vicious propensities are the most common of the N/O issued.

When a case reaches the level of a criminal matter if warranted KCACC will issue a criminal infraction or submit a Certification for Probable Cause to the Prosecuting Attorney for felony criminal charges.

**Staffing**

KCACC field operations currently has staffing allotments for daily staffing of seven officers, one field sergeant and a Lead Cruelty Investigator (absent any absences due to s/l, vacation, backfilling shelter) to meet the customer service needs of the citizens in the field for the full compliment of calls for assistance from the public and local law enforcement. If the legislative body goes forward with a chaining ordinance it would be prudent to conduct an analysis of status-quo staffing compared to the staffing necessary to meet the increase requests of the public to administer the anticipated increase in service requests. Below is a comparison of current KCACC staffing and the International City/County Management Association recommendations. This staffing recommendation is modeled after the National Animal Control Association (NACA) recommendations.

| Current KCACC Field Ops Staffing | ICMA Recommended Field Ops Staffing, (Handy, 2001, 55) |
|---|---|
| 1 Officer to 170,000 Citizens | 1 Officer to 16,000 – 18,000 Citizens |

**Conclusion**

In determining the most appropriate direction in considering a ban on chaining, tethering and small space confinement it is important to consider several factors. Consider whether the infrastructure and tools are already in place to enforce such an ordinance, whether those tools and resources are sufficient, and what the effect will be on the citizens and animals in King County. During anytime but especially during an economic crisis certain aspects may be cost prohibitive for the citizens King County serves. Review the existing statutes and the ability and flexibility to use them to prosecute the identified adverse behavior. Consider the potential increase of dogs into the shelters and the possibility of an increase in euthanasia as a result.

Resign yourself with the fact public service demands and service calls will increase as a result and the County will have to consider revising its current staffing model in order to meet those needs. The Guild does not believe the result of a Chaining/Tethering Ordinance will significantly reduce the number of vicious dog and bite incidents reported to KCACC. These vicious dogs will still be

vicious dogs. The proposed ordinance will also not have a significant impact on cruelty complaints. As stated above, chaining is secondary to allegations of abuse of an animal. The converse is true. Enactment of such an ordinance will increase calls to KCACC with negative results.

Enforcement can be problematic for officers. The determination of the facts during the course of an investigation will be difficult and time consuming. An outright ban will be easier to enforce, but will have adverse impact on the citizens of King County. If the County decides a ban is the way to go it is important to consider exceptions for those responsible citizens who are not abusing their pet, but allowing exercise and giving time outside, whereas, a ban may not allow them the opportunity. Allowable exceptions (cable tie out, etc) under the ordinance will lessen the impact on the dog owners of King County. A third option is the least invasive and most fiscally sound, for both King County and the citizens, status quo with an emphasis on enforcement of existing laws when a situation/incident falling under our jurisdiction manifests itself with a chained/tethered dog.

## References


Dictionary.com Unabridged (2006). Random House Dictionary. Retrieved from the internet February 18, 2009. http://dictionary.reference.com

Handy, G.L. (2001). ICMA, International City/County Management Association. Animal control management — a guide to local governments. ICMA: Washington, DC.

King County Code (2007). Title 11: Animal Control. Seattle, WA: King County Council.

U.S. Department of Agriculture (2003). Animal Welfare Act and Regulations. Code of Federal Regulations, Title 9, Part 3, Standards. Beltsville, MD: USDA

Washington State (2006) RCW 16.52.205 Animal Cruelty in the First Degree. Olympia, WA: Washington State Legislature

Washington State (2007) RCW 16.52.205 Animal Cruelty in the Second Degree. Olympia, WA: Washington State Legislature


## Appendix

King County Code (KCC)

**11.04.225 Additional enforcement - cruelty to animals.**

A. The manager of the animal care and control authority may prohibit a person who is issued a notice and order for violation of K.C.C. 11.04.250 or who is either charged or convicted

of animal cruelty under either RCW 16.52.205 or 16.52.207 from owning, harboring, keeping or maintaining any animal if the manager determines that the enforcement furthers the purposes of this chapter, in accordance with the following: a person may be prohibited from owning, harboring, keeping or maintaining any animal:

1. For up to four years, if the person is found in violation of the animal cruelty provisions of K.C.C. 11.04.250 or convicted of a misdemeanor under RCW 16.52.207;

2. Indefinitely, if the person is convicted of a felony under RCW 16.52.205; or

3. Pending the final adjudication of either a notice and order issued under K.C.C. 11.04.250 or a charge under RCW 16.52.205 or 16.52.207.

B. The director or authorized animal care and control officer may enforce this section through the notice and order process in K.C.C. 11.04.260. A notice and order issued to enforce this section is subject to appeal, in accordance with K.C.C. 11.04.270. (Ord. 15801 § 66, 2007).

**11.04.250 Violations - unlawful acts - cruelty to animals - database.**

A. It is unlawful for any person to:

1. Willfully and cruelly injure or kill any animal by any means causing it fright or pain;

2. By reason of neglect or intent to cause or allow any animal to endure pain, suffering or injury or to fail or neglect to aid or attempt alleviation of pain, suffering or injury the person has so caused to any animal;

3. Lay out or expose any kind of poison, or to leave exposed any poison food or drink for humans, animals or fowl, or any substance or fluid whatever whereon or wherein there is or shall be deposited or mingled, any kind of poison or deadly substance or fluid whatever, on any premises, or in any unenclosed place, or to aid or abet any person in so doing, unless in accordance with RCW 16.52.190; and

4. Abandon any domesticated animal by dropping off or leaving the animal on the street, road or highway, in any other public place or on the private property of another.

B. The animal care and control section shall keep a database containing the names of all persons who are either or both found in violation of K.C.C. 11.04.250 or charged or convicted of animal cruelty under either RCW 16.52.205 or 16.52.207, or both. Further, the animal care and control section shall coordinate with law enforcement, when necessary, to keep this database current. (Ord. 15801 § 24, 2007: Ord. 14498 § 13, 2002: Ord. 1396 Art. III § 8, 1972).

<u>Revised Code of Washington (RCW) (</u>abbreviated)

**RCW 16.52.205 Animal Cruelty in the first degree**

(1) A person is guilty of animal cruelty in the first degree when, except as authorized in law, he or she intentionally (a) inflicts substantial pain on, (b) causes physical injury to, or (c) kills an animal by a means causing undue suffering, or forces a minor to inflict unnecessary pain, injury, or death on an animal.

(2) A person is guilty of animal cruelty in the first degree when, except as authorized by law, he or she, with criminal negligence, starves, dehydrates, or suffocates an animal and as a result causes: (a) Substantial and unjustifiable physical pain that extends for a period sufficient to cause considerable suffering; or (b) death.

(3) A person is guilty of animal cruelty in the first degree when he or she:

(a) Knowingly engages in any sexual conduct or sexual contact with an animal;

(b) Knowingly causes, aids, or abets another person to engage in any sexual conduct or sexual contact with an animal;

(c) Knowingly permits any sexual conduct or sexual contact with an animal to be conducted on any premises under his or her charge or control;

(d) Knowingly engages in, organizes, promotes, conducts, advertises, aids, abets, participates in as an observer, or performs any service in the furtherance of an act involving any sexual conduct or sexual contact with an animal for a commercial or recreational purpose; or

(e) Knowingly photographs or films, for purposes of sexual gratification, a person engaged in a sexual act or sexual contact with an animal.

**RCW 16.52.207 Animal Cruelty in the second degree**

(1) A person is guilty of animal cruelty in the second degree if, under circumstances not amounting to first degree animal cruelty, the person knowingly, recklessly, or with criminal negligence inflicts unnecessary suffering or pain upon an animal.

(2) An owner of an animal is guilty of animal cruelty in the second degree if, under circumstances not amounting to first degree animal cruelty, the owner knowingly, recklessly, or with criminal negligence:

(a) Fails to provide the animal with necessary shelter, rest, sanitation, space, or medical attention and the animal suffers unnecessary or unjustifiable physical pain as a result of the failure;

(b) Under circumstances not amounting to animal cruelty in the second degree under (c) of this subsection, abandons the animal; or

(c) Abandons the animal and (i) as a result of being abandoned, the animal suffers bodily harm; or (ii) abandoning the animal creates an imminent and substantial risk that the animal will suffer substantial bodily harm.

# Appendix C (input from King County Sheriff's Office)

Here is my response, authored by Sergeant Nancy Spadoni. Please let me know if you need anything further.

Continuous chaining, tethering or confining of a dog has the potential to create an anti-social and aggressive dog. Dogs are social, pack animals that want companionship. When chained or tethered it is as if they are in solitary confinement. They change psychologically and become fearful or very territorial. In many cases when one of these dogs gets loose, or a person (often a child) wanders into their territory the dog will aggressively attack causing severe injuries and oftentimes death.

If the KC Code were to be changed to reflect such an ordinance, the concerns would be that it is enforceable. The code would need to be specific to times of the day **or** lengths of time that the dog could or could not be chained/confined. For example, Orange County, Florida's ordinance does not allow tethering between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. (specific) or during times of extreme weather (somewhat subjective.) The ordinance would need to be crafted in such a way that subjectivity is left to a minimum. In addition, the type of "collar" around the dog's neck should not be ignored. Oftentimes, a dog has no collar and the actual chain that is used for the tie-out is tied around the dog's neck which can eventually "grow" into the dog's skin.

**Cost of implementation**: It would be difficult to estimate any cost at this point unless there were to be specific personnel allocated to go about the county and look for chained up dogs. I would assume that this would not be the case and existing Animal Control Officers and Sheriff's Deputies would simply add this to their arsenal of laws/codes to enforce. Costs could go up in the shelter if the animal is impounded after a failure to comply with a written warning, citation, etc, and the conditions were deemed cruel.

The **Public could be educated** at no cost by utilizing the King County Website, the Sheriff's website and the Animal Control website if and when the ordinance passes, or even if it doesn't pass it is a good piece for community education to pass on the information I listed in the first paragraph about chained/tethered dogs and what happens to them psychologically. Additionally, simple flyers could be generated that could be available at any Precinct and at the Shelter at a small cost for production.

**The impacts to public health and safety** would be hard to measure, but would clearly be present. Dangerous and aggressive dogs are one of the biggest problems facing Animal Control and many times KCSO. Quite often KCSO is dispatched to assist Animal Control in containing one of these dogs. Many times KCSO has been tragically forced to use a firearm on the scene to control one of these dogs. There couldn't be a worse situation for anyone involved. The danger to citizens when we have to fire our weapon in the middle of the street at one of these unsocialized, aggressive dogs cannot be overstated. If there is any way to alleviate the population of these dogs by not creating them in the first place, then we have all been successful.

**Humane standards** and expectations are very high in the King County and surrounding areas. We are fortunate to live in such a diverse area where people have the ability to look beyond themselves and see the virtue in treating each other and all creatures with kindness. The citizenry of our area is upset with crimes of this nature which is why they always make the news. Organizations such as PAWS, the Humane Society of Seattle-King County, and Pasados, will always be vigilant in keeping the standards high in the area of animal welfare. And we should work together to see that laws and codes can be carried out.

**Implementation** in the Unincorporated areas is quite easy. King County Code can be enforced, and the training for Deputies is very minimal, with really no cost associated in training the new code. In the contract Cities it should be equally as seamless as long as the KC Code can be enforced within the jurisdiction. If not, the Cities will have to pass their own Municipal Ordinance. The only area that could be of concern might be the Muckleshoot Indian Reservation. They do not recognize County Code. They have agreed to recognize RCW, but not KC Code. Chief Loy could be consulted to verify this information or work with the Tribe, however, the decision would be that of the Tribal Council.

**King County Code/ enforcement**
A ban would fit easily into the KC Code Title 11 –Animal Control, either before or after 11.04.250 which is the Animal Cruelty Code. The new ordinance should be a misdemeanor much like any other code in Title 11, and enforceable by both Animal Control Officers and Deputies. If an Officer or Deputy responds to a residence on a call of this type there should be discretion for the Officer/Deputy to handle to situation. Perhaps education might be the best tool in some circumstances, however, documentation is always key in the event that a return trip to the residence occurs and enforcement action and possible seizure of the animal is unavoidable. The new code could be handled when calls for service arise or as on-view activity by either Animal Control or KCSO. If only KCSO handles the ban or only Animal Control then resources are being limited. Both agencies can easily handle cases of this nature and forward them to the prosecutor's office. However, it should be noted that some of the people that tie their dogs out to live a solitary life, have the dog as a "Bully" breed, or "status" dog, and may be involved in other activities that would require fully commissioned Deputies. Additionally, Deputies have the ability to "run" a person through WACIC/NCIC and check for outstanding warrants and court orders. Animal Control should use caution when approaching people that have chained, tethered or confined their dog, and call for KCSO back-up before there is trouble.

**Issues arising from a ban**
There will always be unforeseen issues arising from any new law or practice. Communication between agencies (Animal Control and KCSO) will be of the utmost importance. The prosecutor will need to set standards for filing that are understandable, and be willing to follow through with prosecuting the cases.

*Sue Rahr, King County Sheriff*
*516 3rd Ave.*
*Seattle, Wa. 98104*
*206-296-4155*

# Appendix D (input from King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office)

11 February 2009

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Carolyn Ableman

FROM: Nancy A. Balin

SUBJECT: Feasibility of Implementing a Ban on Continuous Dog Chaining, Tethering and Small-Space Confinement

**Issue Presented**

You have requested our input for the feasibility study requested of the Executive by Motion 2008-0347, which relates to a ban on continuous dog chaining, tethering and small space confinement. Specifically, you have asked us to consider the following particular areas:

(1) How would such a ban fit into the King County Code?

(2) What level of offense would be appropriate for such a ban?

(3) How would a ban relate to existing animal cruelty laws?

(4) How would the ban be prosecuted?

(5) What legal challenges do we foresee?

(6) What legal challenges have occurred in other jurisdictions which have implemented similar bans?

(7) What issues might arise through enforcement of the ban?[1]

We have addressed each of these issues in turn below.

**How would a ban on dog chaining, tethering and small-space confinement fit into the King County Code?**

K.C.C. 11.04.250 already makes it a crime to, among other things, injure or cause pain to animals. To the extent that dog-chaining, tethering or small-space confinement results in cruelty to animals as outlined in K.C.C. 11.04.250, no changes to the K.C.C. are necessary.

[1] This issue is addressed throughout other sections of this Memorandum and so there is not a separate section with this title.

If, on the other hand, the intention is to ban these particular actions regardless of whether an animal is injured or caused pain, then new language would need to be added to K.C.C. 11.04.250 which specifically defines tethering or chaining or small-space confinement as "cruelty to animals." Several issues would need to be addressed:

- Whether this behavior would absolutely be disallowed.
- Whether there would be a time limit inside of which it would be allowed.
- Whether it would be allowed in some locations but not others (at home vs. in front of retail establishments, for example).
- "Small-space" would have to be defined.

Additionally, the term "confinement" would need to be used consistently with the use of similar terms elsewhere in the Code, e.g. K.C.C. 11.04.290(2)(b). Subsection (c) of that section also would need to be considered if the intention is an outright ban on chaining/tethering, as that subsection currently requires tethering.

Similarly, K.C.C. 11.04.230(C) and (L) need to be considered if an outright ban on tethering is intended.

Finally, another section of the Code which already addresses confinement of an animal is K.C.C. 11.04.540, so the new section would need to jibe with this one as well.

**What level of offense would be appropriate for such a ban?**
**How would a ban relate to existing animal cruelty laws?**

K.C.C. 11.04.190 and 11.04.290 provide that violations constitute misdemeanors. Additionally, RCW Chapter 16.52 provides for misdemeanor, gross misdemeanor and felony charging for animal cruelty.

The level of offense appropriate for this ban would depend on the damage done to the animal but, except in the most extreme circumstances, either a misdemeanor would be charged or just a citation written. This would certainly be the case if no damage or harm came to the animal, but it is important to note that under the current RCW, even "knowingly, recklessly or with criminal negligence inflicting unnecessary suffering or pain upon an animal" is (just) a misdemeanor.

A felony would be charged if the forbidden behavior caused undue suffering and intentionally caused substantial pain, physical injury or death to the animal (or the violator forced a minor to do so).

It should be noted that RCW 16.52.100 addresses confinement without food and water. In considering the proposed ordinance, it should be noted that this section contains a time limit, providing that if any domestic animal is impounded or confined without necessary food and water for *more than thirty-six consecutive hours*, any person may come onto the property and feed and water it. One question to consider would be whether this would be the maximum amount of time allowable for chaining/tethering/small-space confinement, if an outright ban is not contemplated.

**How would the ban be prosecuted?**

As noted above, the ban would be prosecuted under the King County Code or RCW Chapter 16.52, depending on the level of harm, if any, which came to the animal.

If only a citation were called for, only ACC would be involved. If a criminal charge were submitted to the PAO, then a misdemeanor case would be referred to the Municipal or District Court for charging and prosecution, and a felony case would be charged and prosecuted by the PAO.

**Have any legal challenges occurred in other jurisdictions with similar bans?**

We did not find that any legal challenges have occurred in other jurisdictions with similar bans.

For your information, nationwide there are a number of "Anti-Chaining Laws": Five are statewide (California, Connecticut, Texas, Virginia and West Virginia); twenty-two are community-wide (representing twenty-six states); and thirty-two permit tethering if other conditions are met (representing sixteen states and the District of Columbia). *See Appendix A.*

**Are any legal challenges foreseen?**

No, but there are a few scenarios to consider in drafting this prohibition.

If an outright ban on chaining, tethering or close confinement is contemplated, exceptions or allowable scenarios would have to be addressed. For example, suppose that the dog's owners are working in their yard and want the dogs outside with them. They tie them on leashes or chains to a tree, or to a stake in the ground. Would this be forbidden? Forbidden only after an allotted amount of time? Or allowed for as long as the owners are outside with them? How long would the tether have to be? Does each dog have to be on a separate one?

Another existing RCW to consider is RCW 16.52.080 which provides that a person who "wilfully [sic] transports or confines or causes to be transported *or confined* any domestic animal or animals in a manner, posture or confinement that will jeopardize the safety of the animal or the public shall be guilty of a misdemeanor." If the ban will include, as contemplated, "small-space confinement," such prohibition may be seen as being in conflict with this section, which allows it and does not specify what type of "confinement" is considered to jeopardize an animal's safety.

# Appendix E (input from National Animal Control Association)

Currently NACA does not have a written policy on tethering.

Tethering laws are being researched and enacted in many areas of our country by state and local authorities. I anticipate that NACA will be entering into similar discussions in the future and will develop a written policy/opinion. NACA has no written policy or recommendation at this time.

I would be happy to advise the board of your inquiry and your interest in this area. We want to be a resource for our members.

Thank you,

Nancy Hill
NACA Board of Directors

Animal Protection Director
SCRAPS - Spokane County Regional Animal Protection Service
2521 N Flora Road
Spokane Valley, WA 99216
Desk: 509.477.1967
Fax: 509.477.4745
Email: nhill@spokanecounty.org
Website: www.spokanecounty.org/animal

"Building a more humane community, protecting public safety and ensuring animal welfare through compassionate, responsive, professional enforcement of laws and public policy."

Protecting People -Protecting Pets -Saving Lives

# Appendix F (input from proponents and opponents)

**From:** Andy Hwang [mailto:Andy.Hwang@cityoffederalway.com]
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 17, 2009 5:48 PM
**To:** Cockbain, Sean
**Cc:** Brian Wilson; Cathy Schrock
**Subject:** FW: dog tethering study

Ms. Ableman:

The Federal Way Police Department documented in 2007 20 aggressive/dog bite incidents. In eight months of 2008 (1/1/08 - 8/23/08), we documented 26 incidents where our residents were attacked or bitten by a dog. As a general rule, we do not address nuisance and miscellaneous animal complaints. This responsibility rests with the King County Animal Control. If this new law is enacted, we don't believe it will have a significant impact to our agency as we believe these complaints will and should be addressed by the Animal Control. Our Department will continue to cooperative and work in partnership with Animal Control to solve problems or investigate significant cases. If we can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Andy J. Hwang
Deputy Chief of Police
253.835.6716
andy.hwang@cityoffederalway.com

---

**From:** Pingrey, Daniel
**Sent:** Thursday, February 12, 2009 9:02 AM
**To:** Ableman, Carolyn
**Subject:** RE: dog tethering study

What are the options? No pets unless you have a large backyard or let them run free and see what happens? You are depending on people making responsible decisions. No matter what happens you will have people that will still violate this law and no $ or personnel to enforce.

I understand what they are trying to prevent but I don't think it is a viable or economically responsible statute at this time.

Chief Dan Pingrey
Shoreline Police Department
206-423-6019

---

**AMERICAN HUMANE SUPPORTS LEGISLATION THAT ADRESSES EXCESSIVE TETHERING OF DOGS**

Tethering dogs outside for excessive durations is inhumane, unnecessary, and a severe threat to public safety. For the welfare of humans, animals, and entire communities, the law must address this inhumane practice. For this reason, American Humane supports legislation that seeks to prohibit

excessive tethering as a primary means of housing a dog, limit the amount of time dogs can be tethered in a 24-hour period, and allow tethered dogs access to adequate shade, food, shelter, and water.[1]
Tethering is the practice of restraining a dog to a stationary object, usually in the owner's backyard, as a means of controlling the dog. If tethered for more than a few hours at a time, these highly social animals suffer from severe stress, isolation, and even physical pain. Many are forced to sleep, sit, eat, and relieve themselves all within a confined area and often without access to shelter. Their necks suffer from improperly fitted collars and from constantly straining to break free from confinement. In some of the worst cases of neglect, the collars become deeply embedded into their skin.
In 1996, the U.S. Department of Agriculture issued a statement that affirmatively designated excessive tethering as an inhumane practice.[2] In 1997, the agency ruled that people and organizations regulated by the Animal Welfare Act cannot keep dogs continuously chained.[3] Despite these actions, tethering remains an overlooked social issue which, to this day, is rarely even investigated.
In addition to its detrimental effect on dogs, excessive tethering also directly threatens public safety. In many cases, the devastating conditions brought by excessive tethering and lack of socialization forces dogs to become aggressive and attack any unfamiliar animal or person that

[1] In addition to the aforementioned qualities, model legislation would provide exemptions for search and rescue dogs, licensed dog training activities, and working dogs involved in livestock herding and agricultural cultivation.

[2] The USDA issued a statement in the July 2, 1996 Federal Register against tethering: "Our experience in enforcing the Animal Welfare Act has led us to conclude that continuous confinement of dogs by a tether is inhumane. A tether significantly restricts a dog's movement. A tether can also become tangled around or hooked on the dog's shelter structure or other objects, further restricting the dog's movement and potentially causing injury. The dog-tethering rule is designed to prevent the practice of permanently tethering dogs and not allowing them proper exercise as specified under the Animal Welfare Act"
61 Fed. Reg. 34,466 (July 2, 1996).

[3] See Animal Care Resource Guide: Research Facility Inspection Guide at
http://www.aphis.usda.gov/ac/researchmanual/11-5STRU.PDF.

approaches their confined space.[4] In fact, the American Veterinary Medical Association stated in a May 2003 press release for Dog Bite Prevention Week: "[n]ever tether or chain your dog because this can contribute to aggressive behavior."[5] Each year throughout this nation, young, curious children are attacked and killed when they approach dogs that have been excessively tethered[6].

[4] Gershman KA, Sacks, JJ, Wright, JC *Which Dogs Bite? A Case-Control Study of Risk Factors* (Pediatrics, p. 913-917 (1994) (A study by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention found that chained dogs are 2.8 times more likely to bite than unchained dogs).

[5] See Journal of Veterinary Medicine Association News Online at
http://www.avma.org/onlnews/javma/may03/030515n.asp (May 15, 2003).

[6] Seventeen percent of dogs involved in fatal attacks on humans between 1979 and 1988 were restrained on their owners' property at the time of the attack. *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association* (September 15, 2000).

As the oldest national non-profit organization dedicated to protecting both children and animals from abuse, neglect, and exploitation, the American Humane Association will continue to encourage state legislatures to ensure that excessive dog tethering is acknowledged as a serious threat to both humans and animal welfare. Doing so will help prevent the needless suffering and death of animals and children while paving the way for a more humane society for future generations.

---

Thanks for inviting comments. We have kept dogs and raised puppies for quite some time, with humane and loving treatment always at the top of our priority list.

Tethering in itself is not unkind or inhumane. It is important to keep dogs safe, at night and when the owner is gone. There are two good ways to do this - tethering and kenneling. Both have their proponents. We prefer to tether our dogs inside next to a window, because the dogs really enjoy the view of the outdoors, which they would not get from within a kennel. They are also free to move around a little more, and it is easier to ensure that water is always available. A third approach, in good weather, is to allow the dog to run free in an outside fenced yard, which we do when we are home. But there are concerns about potential unsupervised interaction with people - especially children, or the rare cases of adults who dislike dogs and have access to attempt poisoning or other abuse.

I have concerns with the proposed regulations. Good owners will be prevented from making good decisions, and bad owners will ignore the regulations. In the unincorporated KC area where we live, this is already the case with leash and licensing laws. We license our pets, and keep them from being neighborhood nuisances, while many if not most owners in our area do not license. Dogs run loose, and Animal Control is not responsive.

It is also true that additional regulations always involve additional bureaucracy to implement and enforce, even though they are often ineffective. Resources can be better spent in education and caring for neglected animals. For example, we contribute to the Rhodesian Ridgeback Rescue fund - we would love to take our license fees and use them to make increased contributions.

So ... we are not in favor of regulations which arbitrarily limit responsible owners, and take away from resources needed to improve animal well being.

Bob and Marcia Vos
Auburn
360.825.6660 (H)

(Member – King County Agriculture Commission)

---

I have read the Motion 2008-0347 and agree with the Motion. I would like the Executive to consider all the elements of the feasibility study.

Years ago, I had a neighbor who had his beautiful German Shepherd chained to a tree ALL the time. Now I wish I had reported the family for animal cruelty. It was sad to see the dog outside chained and **never** walked.

Our President of the Homeowners' Association sent a letter complaining about the dog's barking (certainly understandable for the dog) but really caused a nuisance. The family moved out of the neighborhood and into a very expensive, high-end house in Lake of the Woods. He was employed by Microsoft. I can only believe someone in that neighborhood took pity on the poor dog and reported the family to Animal Control.

I hope this helps with your survey.

Mary Filkins
Upper Bear Creek Community Council member

---

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the motion by the King County Council to study a potential ban on continuous dog tethering in King County. In Washington State, animal bites to people are

reportable to local public health departments, as required by WAC 246-101. Public health departments assess the risk of rabies related to reported bites and recommends post-exposure rabies prophylaxis and other treatments for the bite victim when indicated.

Dog bites are a major public health issue, and one that lends itself to prevention strategies. Nationwide, the federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimates that almost 5 million people are bitten by dogs every year, with about 800,000 of these people requiring medical attention, often at an emergency room. Children under 12 are almost half of the bite victims. Each year in the U.S. about a dozen people are killed by dogs, with children and the elderly most at risk of a fatal dog attack.

Public Health--Seattle & King County is supportive of effective measures to reduce the incidence of animal bites, and thus we are interested in the results of the forthcoming study on dog tethering. However, this is not an issue that Public Health staff have researched nor have we collected local data on the incidence of bites from tethered dogs, so we do not know what effect a tethering ban might have in terms of reducing dog bites to residents of King County. It could be that a ban would reduce aggresive tendencies in dogs subjected to prolonged or improper tethering. On the other hand, it could be that the effect would be more dogs running at large, which could increase the number of bites.

Please keep us informed as this issue is researched per the Council's motion. We will be happy to review the findings of the study and participate in further discussion of the potential impact of a tethering ban in regards to public health and safety.

Sharon G. Hopkins, DVM, MPH

Sharon G. Hopkins, DVM, MPH
Public Health Veterinarian
Environmental Health Services Division
Public Health--Seattle & King County
401 5th Ave, Suite 1100 Seattle, WA 98104
PH: (206)263-8454 FAX: (206)296-0189
sharon.hopkins@kingcounty.gov

---

I just wanted to pass along these resources for your chaining feasibility study from the Humane Society of the United States.

Thank you,

Dan Paul
Washington State Director
**The Humane Society of the United States**
1037 NE 65th St. #186
Seattle, WA 98115
(206) 913-2280
dpaul@humanesociety.org
www.humanesociety.org

**What Kind of Chaining Ordinance Is Right for Your Community?**

There are 3 major options for chaining ordinances and each one is discussed below. While most animal advocates would prefer an outright ban on dog chaining, such ordinances can be difficult to pass. Compromising with a time limit on dog chaining is often a successful solution. In order to find the best ordinance for your community, talk with the local officials who would be charged with enforcement.

Chaining bans

Total chaining bans are the best way to protect dogs and people in the community. Plus, there are no complex definitions, so they're easy to enforce. The only problem is that since this is such a stringent regulation, there's more likely to be strong opposition.

Unlimited regulations
These are ordinances that do not limit the time that dogs are chained outside, but do provide minimum standards for chained dogs. These ordinances generally won't get a dog off of a chain, but when enforced, they can improve the quality of life for chained dogs.

Regulations with time limits or time restrictions
Essentially these ordinances would be similar to the unlimited regulations, with the exception that a time limit would be used as well. Time limits can set a certain amount of consecutive time or time within a 24-hour period, while time restrictions ban chaining during certain hours of the day. Enforcement can be tricky with lengthy time limits because enforcement officers rarely have blocks to time available to verify that a dog has been chained beyond a time limit. However, by forbidding chaining during certain hours, violations of the ordinance are immediately clear.

Get Creative
Even though these three options are the most common, you're not required to use one of them. You can try to combine parts from several different ordinances, or you may be able to find a new solution through a different, creative solution.

If dog chaining is allowed in your community, there should be high standards in place to make sure that chained dogs receive proper care. Also, keep in mind that if you are successful in passing a chaining ordinance, some dog owners may move their dogs from chains to pens or crates. Talk to your animal control office about ways to address this before it becomes a problem. Below are some examples of important standards to include in your ordinance.

Collar/harness
Dogs are typically attached to the tether by a collar or harness. Some communities forbid attaching chained dogs by a collar and require a harness. If collars are used, such collars should always be "properly fitting" and never the pinch, prong, or choke type. There is also the option of forbidding all collars made primarily of metal.

Chain/tether
The dimensions of the tether are often contentious points. Some communities specifically forbid logging or tow chains, but other regulations make that language unnecessary. A tether should not be too heavy and the maximum weight limit is typically 1/10 or 1/8 of the dog's body weight. The length of the tether should be at least 5 times the length of the dog (from tip of nose to base of tail) and never less than 10 ft. The 10 ft. minimum is necessary to provide small dogs with a decent area. Additionally, all tethers should have swivels on both ends to prevent twisting and tangling.

Environment
There's no denying the fact that a chained dog's environment is pretty dismal. However, you can pass an ordinance that makes sure that chained dogs at least have a safe environment. The area should be free of garbage or other debris that can harm the dog. Also, there should be no fences or other objects within the radius of the tether that a dog can get hung upon. Some communities require that the area is kept free of accumulated fecal matter. This may be tough to define, but it's certainly worth discussing.

Food and water
Most basic animal cruelty laws already require that dogs receive appropriate, nutritious food and clean water. With chained dogs though, it's especially important to monitor these things. Some ordinances stipulate that food and water bowls are cleaned daily. Additionally, because of cold climates, it should be noted that water must not be frozen.

Extreme weather

Some communities have sought to protect chained dogs from weather conditions such as temperature extremes, hurricanes/tornadoes, rain storms, or other conditions. Forbidding dogs to be chained outside in such conditions is a good step to protecting dogs. Some dogs, like Alaskan Malamutes, can do well in chilly weather, but short-haired dogs will not tolerate cold well. Also, very old dogs, puppies, or sick dogs will have more trouble in hot or cold weather. It's hard to find universal weather applications, but a good starting point is to forbid dogs to be chained outside during hurricane/tornado warnings, when the temperature is below 40° F, above 80° F, or during periods of lightning.

Shelter and Shade

All dogs who spend any period of time outdoors, unsupervised must have some kind of shelter. Additionally, they should have an area of shade that is separate from the shelter. Shelter definitions vary, but can range from anything with three sides and a roof to very complex descriptions. Here are some basics for all doghouses:

- Must have 4 sides, a roof, and a floor
- Must have entryway to allow dog to easily enter and exit; entryway must have a flap that blocks wind from entering
- Inside, dog must be able to stand up, sit down, lie down, and turn around
- Interior must be protected from precipitation, wind, and sun
- Roof must be slanted to allow precipitation to run off
- Must be raised at least 2" above ground
- Interior must be cleaned regularly
- Interior must contain straw or other form of bedding that is regularly changed
- Interior should contain a partial middle wall to act as a windbreak
- Structure must be sound: no nails or splinters sticking out, no cracks or holes

Enclosure Size

To prevent formerly chained dogs from ending up in airline crates or otherwise tiny pens, try to work a line into the ordinance about enclosure size. There are different ways to set enclosure size:

- Flat size requirement (no less than 150 sq. ft.)
- Tiered sizes (150 sq. ft. for small dogs, 250 sq. ft. for large dogs)
- Sizes based on the shelter within the enclosure (since a shelter must allow a dog certain movement, the enclosure size could be proportionally related to the shelter size)

Along with descriptions of how dogs can and cannot live on a chain, it's important to establish penalties for violations. Most often, violations of chaining ordinances are citations or misdemeanors with fines that range from $50 to $500. Sometimes jail time is an option too, though it's usually only 30-90 days. These penalties are almost always small, but it's important that they're big enough to act as a deterrent.

An aggressive way to enforce these penalties is to allow each violation to have its own fine. For example, if a dog's chain is too short, and he doesn't have water, and the doghouse doesn't have bedding, that can count as 3 separate violations and come with a triple fine. This is a great way to punish serial offenders.

In the spirit of public education, the ordinance should allow first-time violators the opportunity to correct their mistakes. These individuals can be given a short time (1 or 2 days) to correct violations without penalty. Or, money spent on improving a dog's conditions could be subtracted from fines.

Whatever kind of chaining ordinance you pass, remember that every little bit can improve dogs' lives. Dog chaining takes place in urban, suburban, and rural communities all over the country and for various reasons. Try to help these dogs however you can. Ordinances that ban or restrict chaining benefit individual dogs and the community as a whole.

## Sample Tethering Ordinances

These ordinances represent a cross-section of dog-tethering regulations from across the country. Every community has different needs and will require different standards and different wording.

While no ordinance is universally perfect, these samples can be a good starting point for writing new ordinances.

**Maumelle, AR:** Tethering is prohibited; first such law in U.S.
**Live Oak, TX:** Tethering is prohibited; enclosure definition.
**Tucson, AZ:** Tethering is prohibited; not limited to dogs.
**Laurinburg, NC:** 1-hour limit on tethering; no specific standards for tethering
**Orange County, FL:** Prohibits tethering 9am-5pm & during extreme weather
**Virginia Beach, VA:** Sets 3-hour limit on tethering; standards
**Baton Rouge, LA:** No time limit; sets standards for tethering and yard upkeep
**San Francisco, CA:** No tethering time limit; tethering and shelter standards
**Los Angeles, CA:** No tethering unless dog must be restrained while owner performs task

**Maumelle, Arkansas**
Sec. 10-90. Confinement of animals.
(a) Any person owning animals, whether vaccinated or unvaccinated, licensed or unlicensed, shall confine such animal within an adequate fence or enclosure, or within a house, garage or other building. Animals shall not be tied or chained to doghouses or other stationary objects but must be in an approved enclosure.

**Live Oak, Texas**
SECTION 10: Animal Restraint is Required.
(a) It shall be unlawful for any person owning, harboring or in possession of any animal to permit it to be free of restraint either inside or outside such person's premises.
(b) Any animal permitted to be kept within the City shall not be chained, tied, fastened or other wise tethered to any stationary or inanimate object as a means of confinement and restraint to property. First time violators of this provision may be given one (1) to two (2) days grace without penalty to correct a violation of this provision. Exception from penalty shall not be given in any case where the violation of this provision causes or contributes to the bodily injury of a person or animal. An animal chained; not having food; not having water; not having shelter shall be considered separate offenses under this provision and each violation shall carry a separate penalty.
(c) All animals permitted to be kept within the City must be restrained at all times within the owner's premise, by a secure fence, or on a leash or lead.
(d) Any dogs confined within a fenced yard must have an adequate space for exercise based on a dimension of at least one hundred (100) square feet. Provided further that where dogs are kept or housed on property without a fenced yard, the owner of such dogs or persons having custody of such dogs shall provide an enclosure for such dogs meeting the one hundred (100) square feet dimension. Such enclosure shall be constructed of chain link or similar type materials with all four sides enclosed. The enclosure shall be of sufficient height to prevent the dog from escaping from such enclosure. The top of such enclosure shall be covered with materials to provide the dog with shade and protection from the elements.
(e) An animal shall not be considered enclosed by a fence or restrained when and if the animal can pass through, under or over the fence, or the gate of the fence is not securely latched.
(f) A dog that can snap or bite a person through a fence shall not be considered enclosed by the fence or restrained.
(g) An electronic fence shall not be considered to be a fence, and an electronic leash shall not be considered to be a leash.

(h) A dog will be considered to be leashed only when the leash is six (6) feet or less in length or is a retractable leash, and is being grasped by an adult, provided that if the dog is less than twenty (20) pounds then the leash may be grasped by a person who is competent to handle the dog and is over twelve (12) years of age.

**Tucson, Arizona**

1. *Sec. 4-3(2). Neglect.* The purpose of this subsection is to guarantee that animals under human custody or control are housed in healthy environments and are provided with proper food, water, shelter, medical care, exercise space and ventilation. Any person owning or having care, control or custody of any animal shall provide:
   - (a) That the animal receives daily, food that is free from contamination and is of sufficient quantity and nutritive value to maintain the animal in good health.
   - (b) That potable water is accessible to the animal at all times, either free-flowing or in a clean receptacle.
   - (c) That, except for livestock, all animals have convenient access to natural or artificial shelter throughout the year. Any such artificial shelter shall be structurally sound and maintained in good repair to protect the animal from injury and from the elements, and of sufficient size to permit the animal to enter, stand, turn around and lie down in a natural manner. Any shelter which does not protect the animal from temperature extremes or precipitation, or which does not provide adequate ventilation or drainage, shall not comply with this section. Any shelter, all bedding and any spaces accessible to the animal shall be maintained in a manner which minimizes the risk of the animal contracting disease, being injured, or becoming infested with parasites.
   - (d) That the animal receives care and medical treatment for debilitating injuries, parasites and diseases, sufficient to maintain the animal in good health and minimize suffering.
   - (e) That the animal is given adequate exercise space as follows:
     - (1) Within an enclosure that shall be constructed of material, and in a manner, to minimize the risk of injury to the animal, and shall encompass sufficient usable space to keep the animal in good condition;
     - (2) Tieouts are prohibited.
     - (3) Temporary tethering for horses is exempt from the provisions of Tucson Code, subsection 4-3(2)(e)(2).
   - (f) That the animal has access to adequate ventilation and is protected from temperature extremes at all times. In this connection, it is unlawful for any person to keep any animal in a vehicle or other enclosed space in which the temperature is either so high or so low, or the ventilation is so inadequate, as to endanger the animal's life or health. Any peace officer or county animal control officer is authorized to use whatever force is reasonable and necessary to remove any animal from a vehicle or other enclosed space whenever it appears that the animal's life or health is endangered by extreme temperatures or lack of ventilation within the vehicle or other enclosed space.

     No peace officer or county animal control officer shall be liable for damages to property caused by the use of reasonable force to remove an animal from such a vehicle or other enclosed space under such circumstances.

**Laurinburg, North Carolina**

Sec. 4-19. Restraint of dogs.

(a) When a dog is on the property of its owner or keeper and is not within a secure enclosure, it shall be under the direct control of, and obedient to, the owner or keeper. At all other times when a dog is on the property of its owner or keeper, it shall be kept within a secure enclosure, including a fenced in area or electronic fence, house or other building, of sufficient strength and height to prevent the dog from escaping from such enclosure, provided, the owner or keeper may, for a period not to exceed one hour every 24 hours, allow the dog to be tethered or chained to a stationary object or pole as long as the dog is provided with sufficient water and nourishment. All dogs off of the property of its owner or keeper shall be controlled by means of a leash and under the direct control of, and obedient to, the owner's or keeper's command.
(b) Noncompliance with any of the provisions of subsection (a) of this section may result in the impoundment of the animal at any time, or may result in a fine of $100.00, or both.

**Orange County, Florida**
Sec. 5-29. Definitions
*Restraining device* shall mean a chain, cord, or cable, with a minimum length of ten (10) feet, used to confine an animal on an owner's property. This device must provide for humane, unrestrained range of movement for the animal to insure that the animal is not exposed to hazard or injury and shall not prevent the animal from having food, water, shelter, adequate ventilation, protection from the elements or other care generally considered to be normal and usual. This device shall be proportional in size, weigh no more than one-eighth (1/8) of the dog or puppy's body weight, and designed for use with the specific breed of animal with an appropriate collar. These devices shall not be used to confine a dog on an owner's property between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., three hundred sixty-five (365) days a year and during times of extreme weather, e.g., hurricanes, below freezing conditions.

**Virginia Beach, Virginia**
Sec. 5-19. Adequate space for animals; time restriction on tethering dogs.
(a) It shall be unlawful to fail to provide any animal with adequate space. "adequate space" means sufficient space to allow each animal to (i) easily stand, sit, lie, turn about, and make all other normal body movements in a comfortable, normal position for the animal and (ii) interact safely with other animals in the enclosure.
(b) When a dog is tethered, "adequate space" means a tether that permits the above actions and is appropriate to the age and size of the dog. The tether must be attached to the dog by a properly applied collar, halter, or harness configured so as to protect the dog from injury and prevent the dog or the tether from becoming entangled with other objects or dogs, or from extending over an object or edge that could result in the strangulation or injury of the dog. Furthermore, the tether must be at least three (3)times the length of the dog, as measured from the tip of its nose to the base of its tail, except when the dog is being walked on a leash or is attached by a tether to a lead line. When freedom of movement would endanger the dog, temporarily and appropriately restricting movement of the dog according to professionally accepted standards is considered to be provision of adequate space.
(c) It shall be unlawful for any dog to be tethered for more than three (3) hours, cumulatively in any twenty-four-hour period.

**Baton Rouge, Louisiana**
Sec. 14:203. Minimum requirements for dog and cat pens and yards
b) *Minimum Requirements for Dog and Cat Yards:*
(1) It shall be unlawful for any person keeping or harboring animals to fail to keep the premises or dog or cat yard where such animals are kept, free from offensive odors to the extent that such odors are disturbing to any person residing within reasonable proximity of said premises.

(2) It shall be unlawful to allow the premises or dog or cat yards where animals are kept to become unclean and a threat to the public health or comfort by failing to diligently and systematically remove all animal waste and fecal material from the premises.
(3) It shall be unlawful to allow dogs or cats or premises where dogs or cats are kept to become infested with ticks, fleas, flies or other animal-related parasites, by failing to diligently and systematically apply accepted methods of insect/parasite control as indicated.
...
(6) Tethers used to restrict the animal to the confines of its owner's property shall be minimum length of five (5) times the length of the animal, as measured from the nostrils to the base of the tail. Tethers shall restrict the animal to its owner's property. The area shall be kept free of obstructions to prevent entanglement. No tethered animal shall be allowed to endanger the health, safety or welfare of others.
(7) The animal control center shall be empowered to order all animals removed from the affected premises and dog and cat yards until the owner comes into compliance with this section. The animal control center shall be entitled to charge a reasonable boarding fee for animals so held.

**San Francisco, California**
SEC. 41.12. DUTIES OF OWNERS OR GUARDIANS.
(c) The owner or guardian of any animal shall provide proper and adequate food, water, shelter, care, exercise and attention for such animals.
1. SHELTER REQUIREMENTS
No person, except those persons who, due to financial hardship, are unable to provide shelter for themselves, shall keep, use, or maintain a dog on any premises unless the dog is provided full access to an enclosed building, dog house, or similar shelter at all times. The dog must have equal space outside its shelter to move around and relieve itself away from its confinement. Said shelter shall:
A. Have five sides, including a top, a bottom and three sides.
B. Have a floor raised off the ground, free of cracks, depressions and rough areas where insects, rodents or eggs from internal parasites may lodge. An effective program for the control of insects, ectoparasites, and other pests shall be established and maintained.
C. Be cleaned and maintained in a manner designed to insure the best possible sanitary conditions. Excreta shall be removed from the shelter as often as necessary. Rugs, blankets or other bedding material shall be kept clean and dry.
D. Be of adequate size to allow the dog to stand up and turn about freely, stand easily, sit and lie in a comfortable normal position.
E. Have a floor constructed so as to protect the dog's feet and legs from injury.
F. Allow dogs kept outdoors to remain dry during rain.
G. Have sufficient clean bedding material or other means of protection from the weather elements provided when the ambient temperature falls below that temperature to which the dog is acclimated.
H. Provide sufficient shade to allow the dogs kept outdoors to protect themselves from the direct rays of the sun, when sunlight is likely to cause overheating or discomfort.
I. Be structurally sound and maintained in good repair to protect the dog from injury.
J. Be constructed and maintained so that the dog contained therein has convenient access to clean food and water.
2. WATER REQUIREMENTS
No person shall keep, use or maintain any dog on any premises unless the dog has access to clean and fresh water at all times. Clean potable water shall be available to the dog unless restricted for veterinary care, and;

A. If the water is kept in a container, this container shall be designed sufficiently to prevent tipping and spilling of the water contained therein. If necessary to accomplish this, the container shall be secured to a solid structure or secured in the ground. Watering containers shall be kept clean, kept out of sun, and must be emptied and refilled with fresh water at least once a day; or
B. If the water is provided by an automatic or demand device, the water supply connected to the device must function 24 hours a day.
3. FEEDING REQUIREMENTS
No person shall keep, use or maintain any dog on any premises unless the dog is provided sufficient food daily to maintain proper body weight and good health.
A. The dog shall be provided food, which shall be free from contamination, wholesome, palatable, and sufficient quantity and nutritive value to meet the normal daily requirements for the condition and size of the animal.
B. Food receptacles shall be accessible to the dog and shall be located so as to minimize contamination by excreta and/or insects. Feeding pans shall be durable and kept clean. Disposable food receptacles may be used but must be discarded after each feeding. Self-feeders may be used for the feeding of dry food, and they shall be sanitized regularly to prevent molding, deterioration or caking of feed. Spoiled or contaminated food shall be disposed of in a sanitary manner.
4. CONFINEMENT REQUIREMENTS
Though highly discouraged, tethering is only acceptable if:
A. The tether is attached to a stake in the ground with a pulley like system.
B. The tether is attached to the dog by a non-choke type collar or body harness at least 10 feet in length which would allow the dog access to food, water and shelter, but free of obstructions.

**Los Angeles, California**
D. Tethering. It shall be unlawful for any person to tether, fasten, chain, tie, restrain or cause a dog to be fastened, chained, tied or restrained to houses, trees, fences, garages or other stationary or highly immobile objects by means of a rope, chain, strap or other physical restraint for the purpose of confinement, except in circumstances where all of the following requirements are met:

(1) The tethering shall not be for more time than is necessary for the dog owner or custodian to complete a temporary task that requires the dog to be physically restrained for a reasonable period.

(2) The dog must be tethered by a non-choke type collar or a body harness to a tether that is at least three (3) times the body length of the dog, measured from the dog's nose to the back of the hindquarters and which tether is free from entanglement.

(3) The dog must have access to food, water and shelter as described above.

(4) The dog shall be monitored periodically.

Lawrence, KS – chaining ban

Pre-ordinance: 800 cruelty complaints (50 dogfighting)

Post-ordinance: 260 cruelty complaints (25 dogfighting)

Carthage, MO – chaining ban
Passed in 1993
The year after the ban passed, dog bites dropped 25%.

Laurinburg, NC – one-hour chaining limit
Pre-ordinance: 12 dog bites per year.
One-year after: 3 dog bites per year.
Two-years after: 1 dog bite per year.

Dodge City, KS – three-hour chaining limit
Pre-ordinance: 173 loose animal calls per month.
Two-years after: 112 loose animal calls per month.

City of Battle Creek and Bedford Township, MI – three-hour chaining limit
Three years after: no shelter surrenders because of ordinance.
Three years after: AC gets 1 tethering complaint per month, "if that."

Frederick pop 223k
Burnaby pop 230k

Burnaby, BC, Canada – one-hour chaining limit
In the two years since the ordinance passed:
-5 dogs have been surrendered because of the ordinance
-44 total tethering complaints

---

**From:** Graddon, James
**Sent:** Friday, February 06, 2009 2:37 PM
**To:** Ableman, Carolyn
**Cc:** Julia Yoon; Craig Ward; Mary Mirante Bartolo; Louie, Annette
**Subject:** RE: dog tethering study

Sean, Carolyn,
I have reviewed the attached document. I believe that without additional detail I am unable to address the questions posed. We would need to know if this is ANY tethering, or if it is some type of continued circumstance over time. And are there additional factors to be weighed, such as a lack of food or water. Beyond this, there is simply the reality of the workload of KCACC to actually address such issues when they are chronically significantly backlogged for vicious dog complaints. We are just starting an enhanced service contract with KCACC for a part time AC officer and I would be concerned about the amount of time that would be spent on these types of complaints.
There is merit to the consideration, but not enough in the way of particulars to actually assess the impact. We would also need to look at the ramifications on our city animal control codes.
Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.
Respectfully,
Chief Jim Graddon

James G. Graddon
Chief of Police - City of SeaTac
Precinct Commander - King County Sheriff's Office
Southwest Precinct
4800 S. 188
SeaTac, WA 98188-8605
(206) 973-4901
**PLEASE NOTE NEW EMAIL ADDRESS - JAMES.GRADDON@KINGCOUNTY.GOV**

Thanks again for taking the time to look into the benefits of implementing a chaining limitation.

I've enclosed the original KCC document (you may already have it) that we presented last year to request a chaining limitation in KC along with a doc that is a copy of what is below. I tried to address the questions/concerns we get. A few details may be redundant between the docs, but below I have addressed more QA.

Please let me know if you need more specific information, need clarification or have questions.

Kind Regards,

Susan Hartland

DDB Rep, Seattle

425-293-4492

WA Currently has cruelty laws, but they are very limited. The minimum standard for care; food, water, shelter is now considered 'normal'. There is not even a definition for shelter; a tree can and has been in some cases considered 'shelter' and that is and should be (legally) unacceptable. King County is considered a progressive county and we need to start leading the way in improving the care for animals that live in our county.

As we learn more about our animals and improve our care for them, we must also move forward and implement stronger laws to protect them and ensure that people that choose to get pets are caring for them appropriately.

A chaining limitation or ban is a step forward to help improve care for many animals and gives law enforcement and additional tools to reduce neglect and abuse.

Having a pet is a choice, when you choose to get a pet the lifetime care of that pet is now your responsibility.

**Reasons for Ban/Limit on Tethering**

- Chaining an animal is a form of abuse/animal cruelty.
- Dogs are naturally social beings that thrive on interaction with human beings and other animals. A dog kept chained in one spot for hours, days, months, or even years suffers immense psychological damage. An otherwise friendly and docile dog, when kept continuously chained, becomes neurotic, unhappy, anxious, and often aggressive
- Rarely does a chained or tethered dog receive sufficient care. Tethered dogs suffer from sporadic feedings, overturned water bowls, inadequate or no veterinary care and extreme weather conditions. They are rarely exercised or interact with their families. Even if they are not left without adequate care, dogs are social animals and when left on chains suffer intense boredom, anxiety, even neuroses.

- Chained dogs have to eat, sleep, urinate and defecate in a single confined area.
  - Dogs can choke to death or hang themselves when they become tangled in their chains or their chains become entangled with other objects. Some are left chained and neglected for so long they develop infections and severe wounds when collars

become embedded in their necks, referred to as "neck rot".

- "Backyard" breeding will be decreased as illegitimate breeders often

  house hundreds of dogs in small filthy cages and on tethers as a means of

  confinement.
- Chained dogs are easy targets for and can become tormented by parasites, other animals and humans.
- Chained unsprayed/unneutered dogs can lead to unwanted litters.
- Dog chaining and dog fighting go hand-in-hand as one of the methods dogfighters use to create aggressive tension is to chain dogs just far enough away from one another so they cannot touch. They also use "log" chains that are thick and heavy to help increase the dog's head and neck strength.
- Chained dogs are also easy targets for thieves looking to steal animals for sale to research institutions or to be used as training fodder for organized animal fights.
    - "Bunchers" are people that steal outdoor dogs for sale to laboratories for use as experimental subjects. HBO created a documentary called "Dealing Dogs" about this horrific "industry". It is extremely common in areas where there are medical schools and teaching hospitals. It is an unfortunate regular occurrence in Washington State.

**Chained Dogs Can become a danger to the Community**

- Dogs feel naturally protective of their territory; when confronted with a perceived threat, they respond according to their fight-or-flight instinct. A chained dog, unable to take flight, often feels forced to fight, attacking any unfamiliar animal or person who unwittingly wanders into his or her territory.
- Many fatal dog attacks are a result of tethering dogs when humans come within reach of such dogs. According to the Centers for Disease Control & Prevention a chained dog is 2.8 times more likely to bite than an unchained dog. Also according to the CDC, "the dogs most likely to bite are male, un-neutered and chained."
- In the period from October 2003 through August 2008, there were at least 239 children killed or seriously injured by chained dogs across the country.

  Chained dogs are the number one cause of attacks on children – there are

  countless news articles about children being attacked by the "family dog"
  and 99% of the time, the dog is chained in the yard.
  This will continue while a dog feels the need to protect its small territory.

  This alone is reason to implement an anti-chaining law.

  Please visit www.mothersagainstdogchaining.org for more information and statistics

**Chaining Law helps Law Enforcement**

- A chaining law gives AC an additional tool to protect neglected animals and help combat animal cruelty.
- Anti-chaining legislation would vastly reduce the amount of complaints Animal Control receives about chained and neglected dogs. These calls divert AC's limited resources in order to respond to these calls about cruelly chained dogs and trying to educate pet owners

about the harm that comes from this practice. If constant chaining is illegal, those resources can be freed for other animal control related purposes.

- Revenue will be made for the municipality through fines from non-conforming dog owners
- Dog fighting is very often linked to gang and drug activity. Making it illegal to chain a dog in this fashion will hinder this 'method of training' and give police greater opportunity to investigate the possibility that a dog-fighting ring is being operated.

A grace period before enforcement of an anti-chaining law will allow owners time to install fencing or find alternative ways to confine their dogs. Indeed, the testimonies of animal control officers suggest that most residents do comply if given a time period and adequate preparation time to alter their dogs' accommodations.

The laws surrounding animal cruelty and neglect through the practice of chaining/

tethering have not changed changed in over a hundred years. Today, most would

agree, it is not acceptable to treat a sentient being this way. Many would like to see increase d public awareness and legislation designed to protect animals from cruelty

at the end of a chain, particularly those we call "man's best friend."

The following organizations call for a ban or limitation of dog chaining/penning as per the criteria above:

- Dogs Deserve Better
- The American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA)
- Best Friends Animal Sanctuary
- Animal Legal Defense Fund
- American Human Society
- Unchain Your Dog
- The Humane Society of the United States (HSUS)
- Mothers against Dog Chaining
- People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals
- The USDA
- The American Veterinary Medical Association
- Virtually every animal welfare organization in the country

**Chaining Law Concerns:**

There is an incorrect notion that Anti-Tethering laws are racist, criminalize responsible dog ownership and discriminate against groups like; Renters, Minorities, Elderly, Fixed income and disabled. No matter who you are, if you get a pet, that pet is a lifetime commitment and requires care, feeding, medical, grooming and lots of time and patience. If any person cannot make that time, physical and/or financial commitment or otherwise take proper care of a pet, the animal will suffer.

A Tethering law is not to take away anyone's ability to have a dog, but about providing better care for our pets and creating a safer community for our children.

- Cost of Implementation

  Many other cities, counties and some states have successfully implemented a chaining ban or limitation. Some of the most effective ways to present this is to let the community know that a chaining law is going to be put into effect and give them 3 months to comply. This will give people time to make the necessary adjustments. There will be some animals that are surrendered because of this law, but these are animals that were not taken care of and the people clearly are not willing to take the extra steps to give their pet the appropriate care. The animals now at least have some chance at a better life as opposed to dying slowly over years in all weather on the end of a chain. In addition, this law is not about seizing animals from people, but giving them a chance to comply by citing them for the first offense and incorporating fines and in extreme cases, to seize the dog. This system will also cut down on repeat calls about animals living outside in poor conditions by giving tools to reduce the number of animals living on chains.

- What about the people that are using the dog for security system?

  A dog chained outside 24/7 solely for use as 'security system" is an ineffective system and cruel to the animal. The first few times the dog barks, you may look outside to see what it is barking at, eventually, the dog will be bored and stressed and bark for attention, bark at passing animals/people, bark out of frustration and soon it will be completely ignored or the only attention it's barking will get is to be yelled at, hosed, barking collar, or worse. This is not an effective form of home security. If the dog was even barking at someone coming into the house, the dog is chained in the yard and thus once again rendered ineffective to protect the home.

- What about people that cannot afford fencing:

  Having a pet is a choice, when you choose to get a pet the lifetime care of that pet is now your responsibility. Fencing or appropriate sized kennels are only a one-time small cost/percentage of the overall cost of caring for a pet. However, bringing your pet to live inside and walking daily, costs you nothing.
  Estimated cost of care for a dog that lives 14 years is:
  Yearly low cost: ~300.00
  Yearly Standard: ~800.00
  Yearly High Cost: ~ 2500.00
  Over 14 years:
  Low: $4,200.00
  Std: $12,468.00
  High: $38,000.00
  (Averages from peteducation.com)

Initial One Time Expenses
Spaying or Neutering: Dog: $200 / Cat: $145
Initial Medical Exam: Dog: $70 / Cat: $130
Collar or Leash: Dog: $30 / Cat: $10
Litter Box: Cat: $25
Scratching Post: Cat: $15
Crate: Dog: $95
Carrying Crate: Dog: $60 / Cat: $40
Training: Dog: $110
Total One Time Costs: Dog: $565 / Cat: $365

Other options include bringing the dog into the home and making it part of the family. Taking it for regular walks will give it exercise. There are thousands of people with dogs that live in apartments and town homes that don't even have yards. Inexpensive wire fencing or appropriate-sized pens are also an option. Groups like DDB can work with the owner to look into low-cost or donated fencing or fence extensions in the event the dog can jump a 6' fence.

- People that have no other recourse for their dog will end up dumping it on the already overcrowded shelters:

  Shelters may initially see an increase in owner surrenders, but unfortunately this is a better option for these animals than living a life neglected, cold or hot, hungry and tormented on the end of a chain. These people that are not even willing to try other options for their pet, clearly are not committed to giving the animal the home and care that it needs.

  Being at a shelter at least gives the dog a small chance to get a home where they are cared for and part of the family pack

- "My dog is my property. Why should anyone tell me how to care for him?"

  There are already cruelty laws in place that tell citizens how to care for their pet (leash, licensing, waste, clean up, etc) an anti-tethering law would be an extension of current cruelty laws. Today we are more aware and educated about the animals we live with and with that knowledge we now should be expected to improve the care of our pets, including veterinary, training and animal control laws. Years ago, the practice of yearly vaccinations for our pets was accepted, now we know that this is not good for them and our practice changes with our knowledge. The same theory applies for all aspects of pet care.

**Who Has Tethering Laws?**

The following states' laws address chaining:

California

Connecticut

Texas

Virginia

West Virginia

Chaining is prohibited in the following communities:

Fairhope, Alabama

Fayetteville, Arkansas

Little Rock, Arkansas

Maumelle, Arkansas

Miami, Florida

Miami-Dade County, Florida

Okaloosa County, Florida

Athens-Clarke County, Georgia

Chatham County, Georgia

DeKalb County, Georgia

Carthage, Missouri

Clayton, North Carolina

Durham County, North Carolina New Hanover, North Carolina Roanoke Rapids, North Carolina Lawton, Oklahoma Austin, Texas Big Spring, Texas Dallas, Texas Electra, Texas Georgetown, Texas Fort Worth, Texas Irving, Texas

The following communities permit animals to be chained for a limited period of time:

Kern County, California

Los Angeles, California

Denver, Colorado

Washington, D.C.

Dania Beach , Florida

Fort Lauderdale, Florida

Carroll County, Maryland

East Longmeadow, Massachusetts

Battle Creek, Michigan

Saint Paul, Minnesota

Creve Coeur, Missouri

Camden, New Jersey Lower

Hollywood, Florida

Oakland Park, Florida

Orange County, Florida

Palm Beach County, Florida

Pembroke Park, Florida

Bloomington, Indiana

Floyd County, Indiana

Marion, Indiana

Arkansas City, Kansas

Dodge City, Kansas

Lawrence, Kansas

Leavenworth, Kansas

Overland Park, Kansas

Topeka, Kansas

Wellington, Kansas

Wichita, Kansas

Jefferson City, Kentucky

Louisville, Kentucky

Baker, Louisiana

New Orleans, Louisiana

Township, New Jersey

Ocean City, New Jersey

Sea Isle City, New Jersey

Wildwood, New Jersey

Wildwood Crest, New Jersey

Albuquerque, New Mexico

Canandaigua, New York

Laurinburg, North Carolina

Orange County, North Carolina

Scotland County, North Carolina

North Royalton, Ohio

Bartlesville, Oklahoma

Multnomah County, Oregon

Oak Ridge, Tennessee

Austin, Texas

Norfolk, Virginia

Northampton County, Virginia

Smithfield, Virginia

Virginia Beach, Virginia

Linn, Wisconsin

Racine, Wisconsin

The following ordinances protect animals other than dogs:

Tucson, Arizona

Southhaven, Mississippi

Raytown, Missouri

Allen, Texas

Waco, Texas

The following ordinances prohibit tethering animals in public:

Fremont, California

Hemet, California

Southhaven, Mississippi

Eagan, Minnesota

Lincoln, Nebraska

Allen, Texas

Richland Hills, Texas

The following are ordinances that apply to certain types of dogs:

Fremont, California

Los Angeles, California

San Diego, California

San Jose, California

Midwest City, Oklahoma

Waco, Texas

The following ordinances permit tethering, provided that other conditions of care are met:

Little Rock, Arkansas

Hemet, California

Fremont, California

San Francisco, California

Alachua County, Florida

Wilton Manors, FL

Aurora, Illinois

Noblesville, Indiana

Terre Haute, Indiana

Bowling Green, Kentucky

Louisville, Kentucky

Dennis Township, New Jersey

Catawba County, North Carolina

Greenville, North Carolina

Bernalillo County, New Mexico

Raytown, Missouri

Lincoln, Nebraska

Ouichita, Louisiana

Baton Rouge, Louisiana

St. Charles Parish, Louisiana

Montgomery County, Maryland

Rockville, Maryland

Nashville-Davidson County, Tennessee

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Oak Ridge, Tennessee

Lubbock, Texas

Richland Hills, Texas

Holly Springs, North Carolina Richmond, Virginia

Many communities are realizing the cruelty of perpetual chaining, it is time communities in Washington address this issue. We hope that Vancouver will lead the way and set a higher standard of care for our pets.

More information can be found at:

www.dogsdeservebetter.org

Contact information for Animal Control officers in communities where Anti-tethering laws have been implemented will be provided upon request.

---

**From:** Frederick Corlis [mailto:twinrivltd@msn.com]
**Sent:** Monday, November 17, 2008 7:58 PM
**To:** Exec.Sims@kingcounty.gov
**Cc:** Lambert, Kathy; Ferguson, Bob; Gossett, Larry; von Reichbauer, Pete; Constantine, Dow; Patterson, Julia; Hague, Jane; Dunn, Reagan
**Subject:** Chained Dogs

Dear Council Members,

I have read the article and the proposal from the Council on making it illegal to continuously chain a dog. Although I personally would not do it I believe the action by the King County Council to make it illegal to be out of the norm.

As a child our dogs were chained and we never had a dog that bite anyone. Nor did they bite or attack other dogs. Although our dogs were not just chained to a dog house or tree they were on a long wire stretched between to points that the chain slid on.

The biggest problem in this county as to dogs and children is the lack of control by their owners or parents. Adults need to be in control and we have raised several generations that have a problem of disciplining not only their dogs but their children. Part of this is evident in the shootings and maliciousness of our young people through out the country. Part of that is and has been caused by those in Government that stick their noses into places that they don't belong and creating this type of blanket policy.

Instead of going after the individual cases we slap blanket rules upon the masses. Each case needs to be looked at separately to determine whether intervention is necessary.

Next you will be saying that I can not put my dog in her kennel as she is a pack animal and being confined will cause her to become aggressive and bite someone. Ridicules

Thank You

Frederick W. Corlis
Maple Valley, Wa.

# Appendix G (input from public)

Please see Enclosed Spreadsheet

# Appendix H (sample public awareness plan/budget)

## Public Awareness Plan/Budget for Dog Tethering Restrictions

**Total Budget: $55,000**

**Plan Elements**
The 2009 Dog Tethering Restrictions awareness plan will include direct mailings and purchases in four mediums: Radio, television, print (newspaper), and outdoor (bus advertising). See below for the breakdown in spending.

**Radio**
100 ads throughout the year (2 ads per week average) on various radio stations in the market.
**$10,000 Budget**

**Television**
Ad rates on television vary widely, depending on viewers (which means the show and the time), ad availability, and demand for a particular spot. Ad rates for local television can be had for about $5 to $10 per thousand viewers for a 30 second ad. So, a 30 second ad on a show that has 10,000 viewers (daytime or nighttime tv) can be had for $100 or less. Based on this purchasing structure, a television advertising budget of $10,000 would keep ads on the air of local station several times per week select times of the year – emphasis on summer.
**$10,000 Budget**

**Print**
Seattle Times – one 15 inch ad once a month (12 ads) in either the south zone (south King County) or east zone (east King County), primarily the south zone (26-week contract rates):
**$10,000 Budget**

**Outdoor**
One Bus Back (full size) and One Bus Side (Queen size) six months of the year:
**$7,000 Budget**

**Direct Mailing**
Direct mail advertising is an excellent way to reach specific target audiences. The total cost per mailer is approximately 25 cents (including production, printing, mailing, sorting). The Animal Care and Control service area includes approximately 500,000 households. The direct mailing plan for 2009 contemplates targeted mailing to the areas with the most dog tethering.
**$10,000 Budget**

**Remnant Ads**
In addition to pre-ordered purchases, the plan also will include **$3,000** for remnant ads in print, and on radio and television. Purchasing remnant ads is sort of like purchasing a stand-by ticket for an airplane – when a radio or tv station or a newspaper have unsold ad space, they will sell it at very reduced rates rather than letting the space go unsold. Organizations that have pre-ordered ads have the best chance of purchasing remnant ads.

**$3,000 Budget**

**<u>Advertisement production</u>**
**$5,000 Budget** (assumes in-house assistance)

## Appendix G
## Council Motion 2008-0347 Public Comment From Animal Care and Control Website

| Contact information | | | Do you support restrictions on dog tethering in King County? | | | As the King County Council considers enacting legislation on dog tethering, if you support it, what are the benefits you see or what would you specifically like to see as part of the Ordinance? | If you are opposed, what are your concerns about dog tethering legislation, or what should not be in a potential Ordinance? | Provide any additional thoughts you have about dog tethering legislation here. Please keep your comments related to the topic of dog tethering and potential legislation. Thank you. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Name** | **City/Town** | **State** | **Yes** | **No** | **I need more info** | **Open-Ended Response** | **Open-Ended Response** | **Open-Ended Response** |
| Rachel | Newcastle | WA | Yes | | | I don't feel dogs should be tied up for long periods of time. I feel if you have no other choice, the time you are at work (a reasonable 8hr day - not longer shifts) would be acceptable as long as the weather conditions are ok for the dog to be outside, otherwise I do not think they should be tied up or locked up inside the house. If you are not able to be home with your animal to take care of them, then you shouldn't have an animal. | | For people that leave larger dogs at home during work hours (for several hours) they should be required to have a long leash so the dog isn't tied to one spot and can roam/run around. It's just not fair for bigger dogs to be tied to one small area, that's as bad as having a bigger dog living in apartments with no yard. I feel it's unacceptable for a dog to live his/her life that way. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cindy Bowers | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | Dogs who are tethered often lack social skills and are prone to violent, aggressive behaviour. In addition, a large percentage of tethered dogs are neglected and in many cases, victims of outright abuse, lacking attention, food and water, and medical/grooming care. The legislation should address and remedy these issues by making long-term tethering or unsupervised tethering, illegal. This will require government response to citizen complaints to become a reliable system which is most certainly not the case at this time. Fines and jail time, as well as losing the animal and not being able to own animals, should be instigated as punishment. | | Animal abuse and neglect is rampant in this country, in this state, and in King Country. It's time we put legislation in place to correct it and recognize that animals deserve a humane, loving existance or are better off with no existence at all. Washington has a slew of professional and reliable animal advocate shelters/organizations and they should be paid to help monitor this legislation so it is enforced and violators, punished. These organizations should also receive county compensation to offer the care and re-training required so these confiscated animals have a second chance at a new life and forever family. |
| Bob Chorush | Norfolk | VA | Yes | | | Tethered, unattended dogs fequently become agressive. I would specifically like to see a time limit of no more than 4 hours/day for unattended tethering. Howver, since this would be hard to enforce, no unattended tethering might be better. | | Part of this legislation should include a means to quantify its effects. This might be possible by comparing bite and injury statistics prior to and after any restrictions. |
| John & Lori Gregersen | Enumclaw | WA | Yes | | | Animal safety is number one! Dogs should have adequate fenced yards not chains. If you must chain your animal for any period of time, you shouldn't have it! Owners must comply or be subjected to warning first, fine second, higher fine third, removal of animal is continue to chain. Who can inforce this? Police, Animal Control. Fire Department. Anonomous calls welcome. I'm sure you could get volunteers to man phone lines, check out complaints etc. | | Put the proposed legislation to a vote. Are the people willing to support it financially and with their actions? Course all the politicians could take a 10% pay cut and that could support it! Just a thought! |
| dinda evans | san diego | CA | Yes | | | tethering is inhumane, restricts dogs ability to excercise and feel some freedom | | many tethered dogs were made mean or became so because of isolation and tethering |
| Matsi Yasei | McKinney | TX | Yes | | | I do not support tethering. | Tethered digs are more dangerous due to boredom and lack of contact with humans. If you tether your dog, then you don't want to care for it. | If you do not want to keep a dog with the family, then give it to someone who does. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| John FEhringer | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | Add to the ordinance to restrict the barking from dogs left home all day in the yard tied up or not. Many people want dogs but just leave them in the yard unattended to bark all day while they are at work or away. They don't walk them or spend time with them tethered or not. | | |
| Vicki Legman | Newcastle | WA | Yes | | | Benefits - 1st it's cruel then: increases likelihood of bites, and these dogs often bark excessively. | | |
| Lilli Ann Carey | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | Annimals would not be left to suffer- They are not solitary animals and so develop bad behaviors- barking, fear related biting and nervousness. | | It very much time to do something about it. If we are a benevolent society we will not condone injustices and brutality to animals. |
| Donna Snow | Olympia | WA | Yes | | | Dogs are social animals that need care beyond life at the end of a chain. Chained dogs are at risk of attacks from free-roaming dogs and other animals. The ideal care for dogs should be fenced yards, daily walks, adequate shelter, food, water, and human companionship. | I favor restrictions on dog tethering | I would like to see King County implement legislation on dog tethering that could serve as a model for Thurston County and the rest of Washington State. |
| Barbara Schiano | New York | NY | Yes | | | There needs to be a BAN on dog tethering. Animals are chained, often confined to small spaces. It is cruel and inhumane and must be stopped. People who do not have time for animals should have them. | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Tiffany Marlow | Bonney Lake | WA | Yes | | | I believe that when a dog is tethered continually or confined in a small space, they become more agressive. So if there were restrictions on it, there would be safer communities. Also I think that it would make people more responsible for their dogs. It is not right to have an animal and keep them conifned or tied up nonstop. The other problem with tethering is when collars are too tight and the owners are not responsible enough to check on them, it can dig into their skin and start growing into them and create horrible lesions and infections. | | I do not live in King County, but would like for them to take this step so that other counties, and hopefully Pierce, would follow. |
| Batya Bauman | Amherst | MA | Yes | | | A DOG SHOULD BE TETHERED NO MORE THAN ONE HOUR AT A TIME... SHOULD HAVE GOOD SHELTER FROM SUN AND WEATHER.... SHOULD HAVE CLEAN WATER AT ALL TIMES AND MUST BE TAKEN INSIDE WHEN TEMPERATURES BECOME TOO COLD OR TOO HOT. | | |
| Merry Orling | Firenze, Italy | NY | Yes | | | | Cruelty to dogs. | The right legislation is important in doing the right thing! |
| Patty | Tatum | TX | Yes | | | Tethering should not be the primary means of containment. | | My companions have a large fenced yard and access to the house. Although there are times when a couple of them want to lay in the front yard to watch the traffic drive by, they are only tethered for short periods of time (usually 15 to 30 mins), have shade, plenty of water and I am at home. |
| Kay L. Kendall | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | | Explain the chain. It is cruel and unconsciousable and shameful to tether an animal to a chain for life. How would you like to live out your life chained? We do not give animals enough credit. Humans need to be educated. | Perhaps you could keep the poor fighting dogs from a life of hell by outlawing tethering. Rather, tether their human handlers to a life of being tetherd to a jail cell. With frequent beatings. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Edythe C Keene | Camano Island | WA | Yes | | | That there will be a law against confinment of any animal, or any animal being tied up. Also a stricter law for all the puppy mills we have in our country, were innocent animals are locked up in tiny little cages. With there only purpose in live is to produce. | | The laws that are in place right now are way to lacks for the crime. We are the voices for the innocent animals and we alone can make a difference for them. |
| June Chang | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | Dogs that are tethered have the risk of being more agressive. They also can hurt themselves choking themselves if they get tangled up. | | |
| Powell | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | Dogs are much more aggressive when kept tethered for long periods of time. If that isn't bad enough, people who breed fighting dogs have a tendency to tether them where they can have no interaction with People. | | I do think there should be an exception for short term tethering say 30 minutes. Just in case someone needs to run to the store, or something similar. |
| Sonja Moore | Canton | OH | Yes | | | I believe tethering should be severely limited/restricted to only a certain total number of hours per day (for example, 2 hours at the most per day). The benefits I see on limiting tethering are many, including promoting compassion and responsible pet ownership in your community. It would also cut down on dog bite injuries that occur a lot more often from dogs that are tethered or chained for long periods and trying to protect their space. | | I believe every community should have laws against tethering dogs for life. It is completely irresponsible and inhumane to obtain a pet and then throw them in the backyard chained to a doghouse (or, worse, with no shelter) for their entire lives. It is completely heartless, and no community should tolerate it. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Marilyn Orozco | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | The benefits are the welfare of our companion animals. The happiest dogs get daily exercise but are otherwise kept indoors. "Outdoor" dogs need to have adequate yet restricted space outside. Adequate means several times whatever length they are for freedom of movement. Restricted means that they can't roam free. Dogs should also have access to shelter, water, etc. when they are outside. Continually barking dogs should be investigated for potential deprivation of basic comfort and companionship. The Humane Society has more information here: http://www.hsus.org/pets/issues_affecting_our_pets/chaining/ | | |
| Brennan Browne | Port Angeles | WA | Yes | | | Animal neglect i.e., lack of basic food, water and shelter for chained animals will be reduced significantly and complaints of barking dogs will decrease vastly. All tethering should be permanently outlawed--period. | | Tethering is cruel and inhumane. If a person is unwilling or unable to care for an animal in the same manner as other family members they should not be allowed to have an animal. Passing legislation to BAN tethering would greatly reduce the number of calls County Animal Control Officers would need to respond to, thus saving the counties and state hundreds of thousands of dollars. |
| janice hartson | everett | WA | Yes | | | no animal deserves to be tied up all the time. I have seen personal examples of this myself in my neighborhoods. there needs to be some type of parimeters in place for these situations.owners maybe would be more thoughtful of their actions if there are consequences for these very cruel ways to"deal with" their animal(s) when it is merely for their conveinence. | - | write tickets-warning 1st then a fine then removal or a variation of the above. I realize people are hard pressed to change,and unfortunatly,some never will. |
| Paul Witt | Renton | WA | Yes | | | Human treatment for living beings, lower costs for treatment of abused and negleticted animals. | | It needs to be passed! |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Shellie Guirsch | Spanaway | WA | Yes | | | Limiting time on a leash with opportunities for the dog to run,safely, but freely. | | I do think that many people feel they are protecting their dogs by leashing them in one spot and many times are. They are at least concerned enough to keep them from ruuning off. However, I also think that many don't see the need to allow them interation and 'free play' time and this really saddens me for these living creatures. That is why I would support some sort of restrictions or law to protect these dogs from being left alone, isolated or abused. |
| Raymond Holmes | Federal Way | WA | Yes | | | I would like to see dogs being free to run in backyards, and no tethering as it is cruel and inhumane. You give any sort of leaway to tether and people take advantage of tethering for the dog's life. Get a fence and a backyard for dogs if you have one. Or keep it in the house. | | Tethering is cruel and inhumane. People take advantage and allow dogs to sit on tethers for days, months, and years. There is a dog in Tacoma/Pierce County that has sat on a tether for nearly 10 years. He is non-sociable and the owners look at him as a posession. Please stop tethering and do not allow this to happen in King County anymore! Thank you. |
| Virginia | Olympia | WA | Yes | | | I believe animals should not be put on chains, especially, all the time. Animals can't talk and someone has to step forward on their behalf. I would like to see owners have a fenced in area, and if they can't then there's no reason to have the animal. How sad to see an animal tied up, it's disgraceful | | I personally know of dog owners who have tied there dogs up throughout the day, and when they went to check on them, the dog chain was caught in a nearby tree, strangling the dogs. Needless to say, each time, the dogs died. I've seen cases like these around the Olympia area and can't believe there is still no law against dog tethering. If owners can't afford some other type of means then they shouldn't have any pets...that's no life for an animal anyways. |
| Valerie Holmes | Tacoma | WA | Yes | | | Fence back yards, no more uses of ropes or chains. | Tethering should not be allowed, period. Keep dogs in back yards, or don't have dogs at all. | Please fence back yards. Tethering is cruel and inhumane. I know of a dog in Pierce County-Tacoma Area near American Lake that has been on a tether for nearly 10 years. This is not the way a dog should live it's life. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Anne Oakes | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | The ordinance protects both animals and the public. Dogs are social animals who become pshcologically damaged when tethered. Owners who tether are neither knowledgeable or caring about the animal they own. A dog's psychological damage can result in fear and agression because it has been abused in an unnatural restraint. Tethered dogs can become a nuisance when they bark continuously in their unnatural confinement. | The Ordinance should be a 24 hr every day measure. Dogs require respect and care and it is the responsibility of the government to create an Oridnance that protects dogs through our responsibility through our stewardship of innocent animals. There is equal responsibility to protect the public by requiring dog owners to provide proper environment for their animal so that it does not become a nuisance or menace to the public. The Ordinance must be a 24 hr, 360 day to prevent citizens from finding ways to get around the fact that tethering is inhumane and an irresponsible and lazy response to dog ownership. There should be fines sufficient to make it clear to those ignoring the Ordinace that it is a serious matter to ignore both the Ordinance and responsible dog ownership. | There will be costs involved in enacting such an Ordinance. An law or ordinance is only as good as enforcement. To ignore the innocent among us and their inablility to call attention to their abuse is to proclaim the lack of humane qualities and responsiblities and to allow events to occur that create callousness within the citizenry. To best care for society as a whole, we must be willing to act and to spend sufficiently to make a difference in the lives of the innocent and vulnerable. We ignore our own integrity as well when we do not act with care and willingness to fund the protection of pets. This non-tethering Ordinace should extend throughout the county to make it clear pet ownership is a responsibility of all within the jurisdiction and there aren't exclusions for those who do not lives within city limits. |
| John Nusbaum | Federal Way | WA | Yes | | | I have been a dog owner for the last 45 years. Labs to more specific. All of them free in there own yards, not chained or tethered. In this same 40 years I have seen very few dogs that have been chained or tethered that were good people person dogs or dogs that one could trust in various situations. Especially around children. | I don't how you can do it or it can be accomplished at all, but any individual that licenses a dog should be asked if the animal has a fenced yard and what size the yard is. The reason I say this is I have a neighbor next to me with a 20x20 back yard with two big dogs. The dogs only see the light of day for about an hour a day and are completely paranoid sciznoids. Totally useless. This is animal cruelty as best. | The only thing I would like to add is that there must be follow up to any law you wish to leglslate or the law is useless as are most of the laws in effect now. If you can't maintain it, don't pass it. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emily Fagan | Olympia | WA | Yes | | | No Benifits only inhumane treatment | Absolutly not olerance for animals tethered over 3 hours. Also put a stop to permitting animals kept in small spaces - no lenels under 10ft square, and must have shelter with water and clean dry space. No more dogs in gross tiny so called "kennels". We have go to do better! | Also, provide community dog parks. More programs that reward good animal care and more programs to educate and provide free sterilization. |
| Sharon Stroble | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | No 24 hour/ 7 days a week tethering. LIFE ON A CHAIN IS INHUMANE. Warning followed by fine followed by seizure. dog tether | | Long-term tethering must be stopped and made illegal. |
| pat zeigler | tacoma | WA | Yes | | | animals should be treated with compassion, and tethering for long periods would break any creature's spirit, man or beast | | The greatness of a nation and its moral progress can be determined by the way it treats its animals. Gandhi |
| Karen Hartman | Kingston | WA | Yes | | | I would like this ordinance to spread to other counties | | If dog owners can not afford to have a fence for their dog, and have to tether them, then they don't deserve to be dog owners. |
| Linda Hayhurst | Kirkland | WA | Yes | | | I would like to see a ordinance that demand pet owners have a fenced area for their pets and dog tethering is not allowed. This is all part of being a responsible dog owner and a humane treatment of a dog. | | The problem is what to do with dogs that have been tethered already and are aggressive. Those animals cannot be just unleashed in a yard that could possible not contain them and they would escape and attack other pets and pet owners. That is the problem that needs to be addressed. Large breeds are usually the ones that have been tethered and large breeds can be a danger to the public. |
| Erin Bookey | Redmond | WA | Yes | | | | | |
| Barb Levy | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | Although you can't legislate how people treat their dogs, I would like to see this become law. I have had a neighbor for years whose dog barks much of the time because he is confined to a small space outside, in all sorts of weather. | | Thanks for considering this. |
| Jan Hart | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | Dogs should not be tethered more than 4 hours per day. Tying up dogs for long periods can make them aggressive. They need socialization. I would like it be a misdeamanor for animal cruelty. | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Stephanie Dawson | Covington | WA | Yes | | I need more information | In the 6 years I have lived here, 3 home owners have moved in/out next door and all have tethered their dog outside - sometimes overnight. It breaks my heart and I strongly feel this is cruel to the animal. My dog is like my son and he is never subjected to being locked outside or tethered. I would like there to be specific laws set about the length of time a dog may be left outside and laws about leaving it outside overnight and barking. | | Dogs should not be allowed to be tethered but if they are, guidelines must be set: length of the chain/rope, range of motion (i.e. is the dog on a line or tied to a stationary object), duration of tethering, and size of crate or yard the dog is in. Weather conditions should be taken into consideration when detailing the law. A tethered dog in the snow? Not OK. A tethered dog in August with no water? Not OK. |
| Gerard Beemster | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | | | Why own a dog.....and then do that {tethering} to it ? it is animal cruelty. |
| Tom | Newcastle | WA | Yes | | | Limits on number of hours per day a dog can be kept on a tether. Greater penalties for extend time a dog is kept on a tether and especially if the dog is a barker | | Extensive time on a tether without human interaction creates a dog that can be hyper aggressive to humans. If this dog is freed from the tether and not kept under control of the owner, this dog is more likely to be aggressive to other humans. |
| Monica Magee | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | I had a neighbor who kept their dog tied up 24 hours a day. There was nothing I could do about it. People should not have dogs if they treat them like that. It's horrible for the dog as well as for neighbors who have to witness the dog's misery. I think these people should be heavily fined and if they still don't abide they should take the dog taken away. | | if we live in a so called civilized society we should not allow people to abuse animals. tying up a dog is abuse. |
| Laurie A Dillon | Tacoma | WA | Yes | | | More owner accountability, better conditions for the animals. Tethering is inhumane. Animals on a leash have no quality of life. If you are going to leash them and ignore them, you should be allowed the privilege of ownership. | | Give these animals a chance of a quality life. Make owners accountable. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| liz sanborn | des moines | WA | Yes | | | I am a large dog owner and took my responsibility seriously when I got this dog. Dogs should not be tethered - period. Large dogs, especially, need a lot of exercise and no one should have a dog if they are not able to provide adequate care which includes exercise. A tethered dog is a dog that is not walked - this dog will be bored, will chew and dig and do whatever it can to get away from the tether. Because they do not get enough exercise they are more likely to be a dangerous dog. A tired dog is a happy dog - the owners needs to be responsible for all aspects of a dogs health - this includes substantial exercise for a larger dog. | | |
| Judith Bloch | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | Tethering a dog for more than a few hours at a time is cruel and dangerous. I would like pet-owner education to be part of the legislation, but there should be a provision whereby animals would be removed and owners fined. | | |
| DeAnn West | Redmond | WA | Yes | | | Time restrictions for tethering and not allowed when owner not present. | | |
| barbara | kirkland | WA | Yes | | | I DONT WANT TO SEE ANY MORE DOGS THAT ARE NEGLECTED AND LEFT OUT SIDE FOR ITS WHOLE LIFE IT IS VERY CRULL AND I HAVE SEEN IT MANY TIMES AND THE DOGS THAT ARE TIDE UP USUALLY BARK MORE | | |
| Darlene | Kirkland | WA | Yes | | | I have a neighbor who leaves her two large dogs in the cab of her truck - day and night cold and hot. I've tried every avenue to help the dogs by calling Animal Control and our local law enforcement agency. There needs to be something that will Thank you | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Tracy McCoy | Snoqualmie | WA | Yes | | | If a person is not able to provide a comfortable, shaded area with adequate water supply and is disinclined to keep their animal in their home during their absense then they should not be allowed to keep an animal. If you cant properly care for a child then that child is taken from you. If you cant properly care for an animal then you should not be allowed to own one at the animals detriment. | | I don't believe that animals are people too. But I do believe that the responsiblity for the care of an anmial which is implied in the aquisition of the animal is a serious one and encompasses more than making sure the animal doesn't starve to death or die of exposure. If you are unable or unwilling to give your animal a decent quality of life then you have no business assuming the serious responsibility of pet ownership. |
| Michael L Carr | Bellevue | WA | Yes | | | My backyard neighbor once chained up their dog in the backyard when they went away for the weekend. By the time I checked out the barking the chain was wrapped around tree leaving only a couple of feet left on the chain. I don't ever want to see that mishandling of a pet again. | | I feel the dog can be chained up as long as the owners are home and only if the dog has room to roam like a "dog run". |
| Sydney Burrus | Woodinville | WA | Yes | | | I forgot to add in my previous comments to be sure and keep the small cage confinement in the legislation wording in addition to the tethering. I can't tell you how many times I have contacted King and Snohomish (I live 2 blocks from the dividing line) county Animal Control Officers to check on dogs that live in tiny chain link enclosures filled to capacity with feces and no place for the dog to get any exercise. | | |
| Emalyn Carr | Bellevue | WA | Yes | | | It will help make dog owners more responsible for treating their pets in a humane manner. | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sydney Burrus | Woodinville | WA | Yes | | | The benefits to disallowing dog tethering are:1. It is physically and psychologically cruel for a dog to be tethered; 2. I do a lot of animal rescue and a lot of the complaints I send in to Animal Control (both King and Snohomish County) are for chained dogs and the filth and isolation they live in; 3. It would reduce the number of Animal Control field officers needed or at least the ones we have could made better use of their time; 4. A tethering law would promote the dog as an individual deserving respect and that is recognized by the legal system. We have an inordinate number of people who feel tethering is a totally moral, ethical and normal way to treat a dog. This legislation would give them a "heads up" that their behavior is not okay. | | I am thrilled this legislation is being considered. Please do not water down the legislation with a numbers game, i.e. "It is okay to tether your dog for 10 hours while you are at work". Or it is okay to tether your dog while you go shopping. I might be willing to go along with tethering a dog for a half hour WHILE THE OWNER IS AT HOME. YOu see what I mean....The deal here is that...if you don't have the fenced yard and the resources to accommodate a large dog, you should not and cannot have one. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Erin Bradley | Enumclaw | WA | Yes | | | A set time limit for any person that tethers/chains their dog outside. I would like to see Washington mimic California's anti-tether law, & to make it effective bring the Sheriff's Department in on any 2nd time offence. | | This subject was only brought to my attention recently when I had the opportunity to interview Dow Constantine about the bill. Since then I have done my own research on both sides of the fence. The final conclusion I've come to is that there's no argument against anti-tether strong enough to convince me that such a vast opportunity for animal abuse should be left unchecked. As a general rule I am careful about any laws that I endorse & take personal freedoms very seriously. However I cannot see any real benefit to the general population that would justify keeping this law from moving forward. In fact as I began speaking to friends and neighbors regarding anti-tether I found that most people assume Washington State already has reasonable laws in place to prevent this kind of abuse! I'm certain that by now you've seen the appalling abuse that occurs from long term tethering, and in my opinion that in and of its-self should be enough to implement the law. But the concern for public safety is also very real. I have read dozens of findings over the past few m |
| Venus Dergan | tacoma | WA | Yes | | | Dogs are social animals-leaving on a leash for constant hours and day makes them unsocial. Usually lack of quality care is involved also. | | I have a dog in my neighborhood who has been chained outside for over 10 years-I have never seen him walked or played with. His owners now state he is not socialble with other people or animals. Its now a catch 22. |
| Tonja Reischl | Renton | WA | Yes | | | Dogs that are not treated well--given attention, stimulation and exercise--are more likely to become a nuisance in a neighborhood. | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Stephanie Messer | Bothell | WA | Yes | | | Keeping a dog continuously chained, tethered or confined to a small space is very cruel to the dog and creates problem behavior. Confining a dog in any of the above ways should be limited to 4-6 hrs/day. Dogs require alot more excercise, mental stimulation and social interaction than they can receive when they are constantly chained or tethered. In severe cases, the dog will start to go mad from being caged or chained. | | Laws regarding animal welfare need to have stiffer punishments when broken |
| Kay Joubert on behalf of Progressive Animal Welfare Society | Lynnwood | WA | Yes | | | We believe the ordinance can be designed to reduce the suffering of dogs, while creating a safer and more humane community. Studies show that tethering and chaining can lead to aggression in dogs. The isolation, general condition of the area they are left in result in unacceptable way of keeping and caring for a dog. We would like the ordinance to include details on what is proper confinement, so a tethered dog doesn't end up in an inappropriately sized enclosure in lieu of being chained. The ordinance needs to be clear so animal control officers are able to enforce it easily. | | We encourage the County to look at other tethering ordinances and anti-chaining information on websites such as dogsdeservebetter.org, unchainyourdog.org and the study done by the Animal Protection of New Mexico at apnm.org. Thank you. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Meredith Dinneen | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | The practice is both inhumane and a threat to the safety of the confined dog, other animals and humans. A dog kept chained in one spot for hours, days, months or even years suffers immense psychological damage. An otherwise friendly and docile dog, when kept continuously chained, becomes neurotic, unhappy, anxious and often aggressive. Animals who must be kept on a tether should be secured in such a way that the tether cannot become entangled with other objects. Collars used to attach an animal should be comfortable and properly fitted; choke chains should never be used. Restraints should allow the animal to move about and lie down comfortably. Animals should never be tethered during natural disasters such as floods, fires, tornadoes, hurricanes or blizzards. Ideally it should not be allowed. Owners need to be encouraged to have their dogs inside, trained and/or confined inside. | | If this legislation passes it will be another small step towards viewing animals as feeling beings that deserve our protection. Until dogs are not considered "property" like an automobile, we can't really protect them. |
| Donette Zbikowski | Yarrow Point | WA | Yes | | | A time limit on how long a dog can be chained and under what circumstances. For example, they must have shelter and water available. | | |
| Kathryn | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | Cruelty to dogs would lessen. Loud, unhappy barking dogs would cease to be a nuisance. | | I hope with all of my heart that this passes. It's such an obvious right for dogs to have. Not too long ago we actually had to debate the merrits of women being allowd to vote, african american's having equal rights, and kids being old enough to be required to fight in wars while being denied the right to vote. The cessation of animal cruelty (chaining, confinement, ect) is something we all know is right. Sadly we have to go thru the debate process in order to recognize these animals' rights. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Erica Glass | Kent | WA | Yes | | | | Having a fenced yard with a dog house is more humane that a short, tight chain on the neck in the cold and wet weather is inhumane. Purchase a large dog run - WITH dog house to keep dry. I encourage dog training..Pet Smart is 109.00 for 8 weeks. Take the family, it will be fun! | see above. How sould you like to be chained? |
| kerry masters | LIBERTY IAKE | WA | Yes | | | DOGS SHOULD NEVER BE CHAINED OUTDOORS OVERNIGHT | | Dogs should be allowed to be on a chain for a maximum of 2 hours at a time. |
| marci dorfner | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | Please make it well known, that cruelty to ANYthing is going to be punished...Make the public aware that the animals have someone on their side now. | | I've listened to the crying and begging of dogs constantly chained far to many times. Their leggs evoled to hunt and after only a few weeks chained begin to shrink..It's not only putting the pet in a physical prison but it breaks their spirit...To put a stop to animal abuse is to show people that this state doesn't bully the innocent. PLEASE put in that law. Thank you |
| Karen Bergevin | Bellevue | WA | Yes | | | | | |
| Barbara Couilliard | Edmonds | WA | Yes | | | That a dog owner be required to fence their yard in such a manner that a dog can roam the yard free, if they choose to keep a dog outdoors, and also that they have to provide decent shelter for a dog that has to spend large amounts of time or all the time outdoors. | | Thank you for drafting this legislation. It is long overdue. |
| Suzanne Miller | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | I have long wanted to see legislation enacted that bans all dog tethering. It has been proven that tethering a dog leads, in many cases, to serious dog aggression. It is an inhumane practice and should be banned. | | Legislation would give Animal Control officers the legal means to remove dogs from properties that are actively involved in tethering. This would be best for the dogs, and for the potential victims of dogs that have been made very aggressive by that practice. |
| Melinda Mast | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | Tethering of dogs should be limited. Specifically, it should not be allowed to keep your dog tethered in your yard all day, most of a day or overnight. Tethering a dog briefly (<30 minutes) outside of a shop or a store should be allowed. | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| P J Kloster | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | Some form of education to pet owners as well as information when they purchase a pet that they have certain responsibilities to this animal. | | |
| Jim Steffeck | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | I see the benefits to be that the dog would lead a better life if not continuously tied up. The animal would most likely be healthier as they would be allowed to move around unencumbered. As part of the ordinance, I think it would be important to put a time limit on how long an animal can be tied up. Included with this, there should be a defined period of time the animal is allowed to be untied. The timeframe should also consider the weather conditions. If it is hot out, the timeframe needs to be reduced. This also applies to other adverse weather conditions, cold, raining, snowing, etc. The animal needs to have fresh water available at all times. When the animal is tied, someone needs to be available in case it gets tangled or is in distress. | | I am in full support of putting legislation in place to protect our animals. I feel stiff monetary fines should be imposed for violations and that the animal be removed if the fines are not paid or the offences are repeated. I understand that this will be a cumbersome ordinance to enforce and you will experience considerable resistance from the offending pet owners. Domestic animals are wholly dependant on the support provided by their owners and when this support is not in place, the animal suffers with no recourse. |
| randi | seattle | WA | Yes | | I need more information | a means for punishing people who neglect animals, giving gov't the authority to do something about inhuman treatment | that it would restrict people like me who occasionally tether my animal outside, for example, while I frequent a restroom or restauarant | again, tethering for a short amount of time is necesary, for example in public places as I described above |
| Jeffrey Holman | Federal Way | WA | Yes | | | Closing a loophole on animal cruelty and giving animal control officers an enforment tool is very important. | | Some discretionary powers for a judge and/or animal control officers is important. It is very frustrating to read in the news about any law enforcement where a judge claims his "hands were tied" by the letter of the law, and that he was forced to rule contrary to what he was convinced was appropriate. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Linda Ruffer | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | A short time limit for any tethering in a yard. Must not be tethered in inclement weather. Area must be sanitary (feces removed) and water must be provided. | | Research has shown that tethered dogs experience barrier frustration and over time are more likely to become aggressive towards humans and other creatures as a direct result of this frustration. They become a danger to their community due to this lack of care. I'd like to see two complaints which are verified by an animal control officer resulting in forfeiture of the animal and restriction on obtaining another animal (if this is do-able). the problem is that these negligent owners just get a series of animals which they neglect or abuse. Thank you to the Animal Protection Officers for the work you do -- I know it is a hard job. So necessary. |
| LOUISE LONG | SPOKANE | WA | Yes | | | Sometimes, tethering is the only way dogs get out without being on a leash. HOWEVER, they should have food, WATER, and protection from the elements readily available. Sometimes, people leave their dogs out while they're at work. It's the dogs that are tied tout 24/7 that need protection. Law enforcement/SPCA (whoever does it) needs to make checking these situations out a priority, and there need to be stiff fines for abuse of this ordinance. | | |
| Aimee Roy | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | clear definition of what constitutes dog tethering, and strong penalties for violators | | |
| CANDACE WINTERS | SEATTLE | WA | Yes | | | AS PART OF THE ORDINANCE, I'D LIKE THE ENFORCEMENT TO BE SWIFT AND THE PENALTY TO BE HARSH ENOUGH TO ACTUALLY MAKE THE OWNERS COMPLY. | | PLEASE IMPLEMENT THIS BAN NOT ONLY IN KING CO BUT EVERYWHERE POSSIBLE. IT'S A GOOD LAW. TOO BAD WE HAVE TO FORCE PEOPLE TO BE KIND TO ANIMALS! |
| Alan Back | Redmond | WA | Yes | | | Improve the lives of dogs by making constant tethering and penning for more than 8 hours a day a crime in WA state. | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Shannon Perry | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | Outlaw overnight tethering or any tethering more than 3 hours in a row. Any time a dog is tethered without access to shade, shelter or water, the owner should be ticketed. Three violations means the dog is confiscated and the owner hit with a painful fine. | | |
| Christy Anderlik | Liberty Lake | WA | Yes | | | Limiting the time a dog is on a chain will: 1. Keep a dog from barking and annoying neighbors 2. Is more humane in many many ways 3. Will keep a dog from developing into a dangerous and aggresive dog. A dog on a chain becomes frustrated and can turn any dog into a potentially dangerous dog with NO socialization. If this dog gets loose. We have a problem | - | Thank you for considering humane and intelligent legislation for do treatment. It's a sign of the times that we treat our animals with compassion.....as part of our family. |
| Carmen Maymi-O'Reilly | sEATTLE | WA | Yes | | | prevent animal cruelty | | I have seen way too many dogs tethered 24/7 in all weather conditions with no access to water or shelter. This is unconscionable. |
| Judy Campbell | Valeyford | WA | Yes | | | No dogs suffering on chains, lfewer dog bite cases, diminish the means by which dog fighters confine their dogs, increase public safety, increase humane treatment of animals, better society overall | | I think in some communities, rather that totally eliminate tethering animals they put a maximum hours per day...which would help people who do not have a fence and use the overhead line with running tether when their dogs need to go outside. |
| lisa workinger | seattle | WA | Yes | | | Please ban it outright. It is inhumane and totally unnecessary. A responsible pet owner should keep their pet indoors or in a fenced yard. Aside from alleviating the animals misery, it will benefit the public as chained dogs bark excessively out of frustration and boredom. | How could anyone with any sense of compassion be opposed to this? | Ban it outright. Ist offense: $500 fine. Second offense: 1 day in jail and relinquish pet. Use the money from the fines to provide free fencing and dog houses for low income and elderly pet owners. Acquire the labor for installing those fences through community service programs. Also attach a provision prohibiting owners from leaving their dogs outdoors overnight. It gets too cold for the dogs and nighttime barking is a public nuisance. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Todd Silverman | Maple Valley | WA | Yes | | | tying up any animal for more than an hour is cruel in my opinion. Any dog owner should always treat any pet as a respected member of their family. Just because dogs cant speak doesn't mean they don't feel. I never tie up my dogs because I want them to be as free as I can let them. A fenced yard gives them a natural teritory. If a dog is not allowed in the house, this person has no right to call himself a good dog owner. | | |
| E. Edwards | Kirkland | WA | Yes | | | The benefits first and foremost are stopping the suffering of chained dogs from cold, loneliness, and lack of care. Other benefits include, preventing unwanted puppies who end up in bad situations and their suffering while being left in chain dog conditions with their mother, dogs who otherwise would become normally socialized dogs turning into dogs aggressive towards other animals and more difficult to care for requiring dedicated responsible owners, and neighborhood peace from the howls of lonely cold dogs. I would like to see a complete and total ban on chains or tethers. If someone does not have a fenced yard, chaining a dog is not appropriate anyways as this leaves the dog very vulnerable to people and other animals. Dogs are pack, indoor animals and deserve to have lives inside with people. Crates are a much better alternative to chaining in the situation of someone having to be able to leave a dog in a safe way while they are gone for a short time. If someone has an entirely fenced enclosed yard then tethering/chaining for a short period may be appropriate but should only be done wl | There should not be any loophole or other exceptions included due to concerns about financial ability to provide a fence etc for a dog. People who are responsible decent owners will provide their animals with what is necessary for a normal life despite any financial difficulties they have. | Let me tell you a little about the dog I rescued Simba. Some old friends I knew lived in a house in Duvall. They happened to live next to a man who is a meth addict. He had Simba (a lab mix female) chained for at least 2 years in the front of his home, having puppies all the time. Simba had only a very short, too short to walk into plyboard like "shelter" with dirt and burlap bags inside. In Simba's "owners" words Simba was his "guard dog". After this man entirely stopped paying his bills he had no water and was refused hose access from my friends house as he requested. However, my friends took Simba buckets of water because this man did not feed nor water her properly. They would leave Simba a bucket of water and look the next day to find the bucket gone. They told me they knew he was taking the buckets of water for himself and leaving Simba nothing. My friend even had to untangle Simba once after hearing screaming howls from the burlap bag that was her only blanket. On more then one occasion and one in particular I remember very clearly, we could hear Simba crying. It was a winter night and fron |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Chuck Gordon | Olalla | WA | Yes | | | Tethering a dog indefinitely is cruel and inhumane. Enacting limitations on tethering would not just benefit the dog herself; legislation would help establish fundamental standards of care consistent with those of a humane community. If we consider our community at all humane, then together we would recognize tethering for the cruel and painful act that it is. | | |
| marann edwards | kirklandl | WA | Yes | | | In general, chaining a dog is extremely cruel. Among other things, it causes a dog to behave aggressively and less likely to obey commands. Dogs who are chained bark and cry much more than dogs who are allowed to run in a decent fenced enclosure. It may be appropriate to chain a dog for a short period of time to allow it to relieve itself. Short periods of 1/2 hour would be much less harmful. There is no excuse to have a dog at all if the owner leaves it chained outdoors and many times makes it very difficult to adopt it out to new owners because of behavior problems due to the cruelty of being chained. | | |
| Cheryl Mitchell | Spokane | WA | Yes | | | limits on the amount of time a dog can be tethered, and limits on how short the teather can be. | | I am an attorney and former chairperson of the WSBA Animal Law Section. My comments are my own and do not reflect the views of the Bar Association or the Animal Law Section. Studies have shown that dogs that are tethered for long periods of time can become aggressive. Some become very antisocial. Dogs are social animals and their basic insticts are contrary to being chained or tethered. I have seen many dogs that are maladjusted because they have been chained up for many hours each day. In fact, we adopted a dog who had been chained up many hours each day so I have personal experience in this area. Responsible dog owners should not use chaining as a way to restrain their dogs. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Jayne Roddy | SeaTac | WA | Yes | | | I would want to see the ordinance heavily enforced; if a complaint is made about dogs being tethered, it should be addressed immediately - will more officers be needed? I would really like to have the law read no more than 2 hours of tethering at a time. I have neighbors that keep their dogs tied to trees 24/7 in all weather and it is very depressing to witness this. It is also very damaging to the animals, who are pack animals and need to be with their people. Tethering dogs can make them aggressive and fearful, as their fight and flight response is taken away - they have no safe place to retreat to. | | I hope that this doesn't just "go away". We are a civilized society and therefore should treat our animals more humanely. Perhaps if owners are educated about this practice they would be more agreeable to the legislation. |
| SUSAN RIDER | RENTON | WA | Yes | | | VERY STRICT TIME LIMITS ON UNSUPERVISED TETHERING/CHAINING; FOOD AND WATER AVAILABLE AT ALL TIMES; ADEQUATE SHELTER PROVIDED; SERIOUS ENFORCEMENT. IF WE CAN MONITOR CARS PARKING TOO LONG, A SUFFERING, LONELY ANIMAL SHOULD BE JUST AS HIGH A PRIORITY. | | SO MANY ANIMALS IN SKETCHY LIVING SITUATIONS (DRUG HOUSES, DOG FIGHT RINGS) ARE TIED OUT IN DEPLORABLE CONDITIONS IT WOULD BE ANOTHER INVESTIGATIVE TOOL AVAILABLE TO POLICE. POSSIBLY THE UNWANTED PIT BULL BIRTHRATE COULD BE FAVORABLY IMPACTED BY THIS LEGISLATION, AS THEY ARE OVERWHELMINGLY OVER-REPRESENTED IN NEGLECT/ABANDONMENT SITUATIONS. WE SHOULD BE DOING EVERYTHING POSSIBLE TO CRIMINALIZE THE BEHAVIORS CAUSING THIS SUFFERING. |
| Nancy Babyak | Auburn | WA | Yes | | | This will decrease the umber of animals subjected to extreme weather conditions and lessen amount of noise pollution from animals barking for relief all day long. | | Fines should go to creating dog parks and dog care education in schools. |
| Brent Bird | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | Benefits: It avoids cruelty to the dogs. Chaining dogs can make them dangerous and more likely to bite people and other dogs. | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lauri Owen | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | Tethering dogs makes them mean and aggressive. Dogs that are tied have the "flight" defense mechanism robbed of them and must implement "fight". Additionally, these dogs, once off leash will be aggressive, territorial, and potentially dangerous. Additionally, the dogs can twist themselves up and become injured. Many tethered dogs are left outside for far too long to whine and annoy neighbors. | | |
| MEGAN WOLF | SEATTLE | WA | Yes | | | DOGS ARE COMPANION ANIMALS. IT IS CRUEL TO KEEP THEM TETHERED AWAY FROM EVERYONE. IT CREATES BAD BEHAVIORS IN DOGS INCLUDING AGGRESSION. I ADOPTED A SENIOR DOG THAT HAD BEEN TETHERED WHEN HE WAS YOUNG. HE DEVELOPED MANY NECK AND SPINE PROBLEMS AND BECAME PARALYZED. TETHERING CAUSES PHYSICAL AND BEHAVIORAL PROBLEMS IN DOGS. | | |
| Nancy Laswell | Redmond | WA | Yes | | | Dogs behave much more violently when chained. It is unfair to the animal and unfair to another animal or person who encounters the pet. Limiting tethering would reduce incidents of pets with threatening behavior. Tethering is not humane and is not appropriate for routine dog maintenance. | | Tethering should be strictly limited in time. An owner should be in the immediate vicinity. This is not an issue about freedom of pet ownership but one which relates to quality of life for the animal and safety for the general public. |
| Aleah Halverson | Lynnwood | WA | Yes | | | The owners that chain their Dog(s) 24/7 after warning would be reported again, fined and dog(s) taken away to shelter. | | I believe it is a form of animal abuse if the animal is teethered for an exscessive amount of hours. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| David Martin | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | Chaining or tethering of dogs is inhumane for more than just a few hours a day. Many leading organizations such as the humane society conclude that practice is wrong and should be severely limited in duration. Tethering can cause physical damage such as sores, physiological damage and cause dogs to develop poor human interactions, sometimes becoming aggressive. Most tethered dogs are forced to sleep, eat, and defecate in the same small area which inhumane and unsanitary for dogs. Also, tethered dogs can pose a danger for other animals. The dogs also are vulnerable to other animals, insects, or even people. Often, dogs that are tethered are also mistreated in general, not receiving proper shelter, clean water, and ample food. | | There must be enforceable rules on keeping dogs contained by means other than constant tethering or chaining |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Amy Sharkey | Bothell | WA | Yes | | | Dogs tethered for long periods can become highly aggressive. Dogs feel naturally protective of their territory; when confronted with a perceived threat, they respond according to their fight-or-flight instinct. A chained dog, unable to take flight, often feels forced to fight, attacking any unfamiliar animal or person who unwittingly wanders into his or her territory. In addition to the psychological damage wrought by continuous chaining, dogs forced to live on a chain make easy targets for other animals, humans, and biting insects. A chained animal may suffer harassment and teasing from insensitive humans, stinging bites from insects, and, in the worst cases, attacks by other animals. Chained dogs are also easy targets for thieves looking to steal animals for sale to research institutions or to be used as training fodder for organized animal fights. Finally, dogs' tethers can become entangled with other objects, which can choke or strangle the dogs to death. Dogs are forced to eat, sleep, urinate and defecate in a single confined area. Owners who | | The HSUS recommends that all dogs be kept indoors at night, taken on regular walks, and otherwise provided with adequate attention, food, water and veterinary care. If an animal must be housed outside at certain times, he should be placed in a suitable pen with adequate square footage and shelter from the elements. |
| Laurel A Back | Redmond | WA | Yes | | | Pets being treated more humanely. We go by a dog my husband and I have named "Mikey" who is chained 24/7. It is so obvious he longs for companionship, afterall dogs are pack animals. We have lived here 3 years and during that time "Mikey" has been chained. We contacted Dogs Deserve Better, they have tried but as of yet, no laws are being broken. It is so sad for "Mikey". | | We, my husband Alan and I fully support anti-tethering and penning laws. Please let this legislation pass! |
| Brookie Judge | Redmond | WA | Yes | | | If I see or suspect dog tethering I would want to know that immediate action is being taken to help the dog. Classes for the owner to take to learn about why tethering is frowned upon would be wise. Hopefully the careless owner wouldn't make the same mistake twice. | This is such a poorly designed question. Opposed to dog tethering or opposed to legislation to support the ban on dog tethering? | Dogs are pack animals; to keep them secluded goes against their nature. Many dogs were bred to dig so keeping them chained to prevent digging is also cruel. Obedience classes and day care exist for a reason. If people can't take care of their dog, they shouldn't have the privilege. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Theresa L. Vierra | Lynnwood | WA | Yes | | | I believe it should be illegal to tie a dog up and just leave it. There should be a time limit on it. There are people who tie their dog up to a bike rack when they are inside a store; that should be fine. So, if you put a time limit on it; say the dog can't be tied up to the same spot over a 12 hour period. The dogs can't speak for themselves. We have to do it for them. Dogs are supposed to be part of the family; not a security item. | | On the part of the law regarding small space confinements; I would assume this would not mean putting your dog in a crate. AGain: I think a time limit would be necessary |
| Jim Pomeroy | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | The county should have the authority to warn, fine and remove animals tethered for extended periods. Public education should be part of this ordinance-many people don't make the connection between this kind of abuse and dog attacks that seem to happen on a regular basis. How about "tether today gone tomorrow"? You're welcome! | | An anonymous hot-tip line should be publicized since neighbors are the best resource for reporting this kind of abuse. |
| Susan Williams | Covington | WA | Yes | | | A dog is a pet. What is the point of having a pet if it is tethered in the yard? What kind of life is that for an animal? It is inhumane to keep an animal in that condition EVEN IF it has adequate food,shelter and water. There are risks of it becoming tangled and choking or some other animal coming up to it and harming it or some cruel human being harming it by throwing things at it, or just tormenting it. If an animal is thethered for a short amount of time, the tethering should ensure safety for the animal and the animal should be at least minimally supervised. | | |
| Andrea Frabotta | Redmond | WA | Yes | | | | | Dog tethering is cruel and unfair to animals. There is no such thing as an "outdoor" dog, except a stray! |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Amber Chenoweth | Kirkland | WA | Yes | | | | I wold like to see King County be a leader to our surrounding counties in banning dog tethering. Chaining dogs is not only inhumane but has proven to be very dangerous to children as well. Chaining makes dogs more territorial and aggressive and this has resulted in many cases of children being hurt / even killed. | This is what I would like to see: Chaining or tethering dogs is prohibited. Attaching dogs to a running line or trolley is permitted, provided that the line is at least 10 feet long. Enclosures must provide a minimum of 150 square feet for dogs over 6 months of age. Thank you for your time and consideration. |
| Gillian Brightwater | Redmond | WA | Yes | | | More humane treatment of dogs & public safety. The law should be specific & ENFORCEABLE. Many animal codes are not and cruelty calls are dropped. 1 or 2 hrs (consecutive)chaining limit. Animal should be attended or watched over, while chained | | New law could be Addendum to the Animal Transport/confinement law already in place...can't remember the # sorry |
| Brandy Rettig | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | I support restrictions on continuous animal tethering for dogs. I would also like to see punishments in terms of fines and possibly jail time for violators. Continuous tethering is animal cruelty. | | I am in support of this legislation. |
| Justin Oas | Poulsbo | WA | Yes | | | I would like the ordinance to have a fine attached to the crime to assist with paying to enforce it. | | |
| Gordon Ware | Kent | WA | Yes | | | We have neighbors who confine their multiple dogs outside in a small pen. They bark constantly, are very frustrated animals. I think this kind of tethering can border on cruelty, is irresponsible, and can create nuisance situation. | | Make sure that the legislation covers both chaining (tethering) and small space confinement. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Terry Boyle | Fall City | WA | Yes | | | From my personal experience, I have to say the ONLY truly vicious animals I have witnessed are those that are never let off their chains. These dogs are not considered to be a dangerous breed, but have become vicious due to constantly being tethered. I know a good number of people who own so called "dangerous breeds" and their animals are not vicious in the slightest, but they are let into the home and are part of their families or are allowed to roam freely in fenced in back yards. Continuous chaining is dangerous...what if the chain or collar gives, and these animals get free? It's not fair to the potential victims (either humans or other animals) and it's not fair to the poor animal being tethered. Their natural instincts don't know how to deal with it. | | |
| aden ryan | kirkland | WA | Yes | | | Tethering dogs for extended periods of time alienates the dog from proper socialization with other animals and people thus producing an unstable and potentially dangerous animal in our community. | | In addition to the social risk long term tethered dogs present t the community, there is also a higher likelihood that these animals do not receive proper health care (regular feeding, hygenic environment and vet treatment) |
| Lynn Gritton | Belfair | WA | Yes | | | | | |
| Nancy Light | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | Chaining a dog is not a good practice. It increases aggression as dogs become territorial. Would like to see at least more education on this, but some people would ignore that and law is needed | | |
| Ginger Luke | Seattle, | WA | Yes | | | I would like to see the city ban chaining dogs as this is animal abuse and is not humane. | | I am the founder of Ginger's Pet Rescue. I have seen and witness horrific conditions of dogs chained and not taken care of. There is no houseing and no water or food and dogs are not treated properly. This needs to stop so please pass this ordinance. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Jill Stutzman | Redmond | WA | Yes | | | Thethering a dog promotes frustration and boredom, and poor behavior. This increases the liklihood that this dog will become an annoyance (e.g. repetitive barking) or be surrendered to animal control causing burden on tax payers. Dog tethering is a sign of owner ignorance and/or laziness. If such people cannot do right by a well behaved dog, what will they do when their actions turn their dog into a mal-adjusted, possible unsafe animal? Let's prevent the problems before they start. | | |
| Denise Zaske | Poulsbo | WA | Yes | | | No tethering allowed. Individuals and families that want dogs must provide adequate fencing. | | |
| Pamela Graber | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | Tethering can be very cruel and owners of dogs who tether should not be dog owners. | | |
| Yvonne Devereaux | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | Chained dogs can become aggressive, people who chain their dogs are NOT taking care of their dogs and are not being responsible. Dogs suffer when chained - they receive no exercise, and often are forgotten, neglected and abused. Please restrict dog tethering in King County. Thank you. | | |
| Alicia Berland | Duvall | WA | Yes | | | There are many benefits to banning tethering of dogs. I have seen the damage first hand. Not only is it inhumane to the dog, but it also creates a dog that is anti social and prone to bitting. There is never a reason to chain, unless it's for a very short period of time. I would like to see the ordinace ban be very restrictive in that a dog can only be tethered for say under 2 hrs and only if the owner is with them (such as washing the car in the driveway). | | When I have seen tethered dogs, it appears that the dog is teathered 27/7, rain or shine. There is no happy medium and I don't believe these people should be able to own a dog. I would like to see 1 warning, and then the dog is removed from the home. Thank you |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Jennifer Havekost | silverdale | WA | Yes | | | length of tether and supervised, time on tether, safety while on the tether. | | There should be a length requirement and a clear place with out debree for the dogs to roam on the tether. The tether must be cose enough to shelter, food and water. Also there should be a time limit the dogs spend on the tether. Dogs can get attached by other dogs, animals, or people with bad intentions with out being to run away while on a tether. This all needs to be looked at for the safty of the dog on the tether. |
| Chris Anderlik | Liberty Lake | WA | Yes | | | To make it possible for authorities to be available for and action on relieving the suffering of animals left chained outside for long hours or permanently without proper shelter or human contact. | | Length of tether and availability of adequate dry shelter, dry ground, food and water must be addressed. Heavy chains must not be used. Trollys recommended. Straw in dog houses |
| Seanna Jordan | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | I think if you are going to have an animal, you should care for it, not keep it tethered somewhere. What life is that for a dog? | | |
| Carol Whitehurst | Tacoma | WA | Yes | | | Dogs will be incredibly grateful for legislation prohibiting dog tethering. If they could vote, they'd ALL vote yes! | | |
| Kim Koon | Stanwood | WA | Yes | | | Tethering a dog must be restricted to no more than 2 consecutive hours, the conditions; dog shelter, fresh clean water, shade or heat from elements, and proper tether must be included. This will signifigantly decrease aggression, breeding, self destruction of the dogs on themselves, fear biting, frustration leading to aggression, inhumane treatment, among countless other benefits. | | When creating this kind of ordinance all angles must be analyzed. Restrictions on what you encourage people to do who have always tethered: kind of enclosures-dog run for example needs specifications on size and conditions- otherwise this could lead to an entirely different problem. Penalties for breaking this ordinance need to be serious and enforced. Patrol (extra officers, or different teams) to assure the new legislation is obeyed must be put into place. Other details like water, shelter and condition of the space in which the dog is kept, if not tethered must be included. ( the dog can't then be put in a crate for 12 hours, this kind of thing must be included) |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yolanda | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | Alternative safe housing conditions, see comment in #5. | | I worry that if tethering is illegal that people will put dogs in unsafe or otherwise unhealthy housing conditions like crates or shelters/kennels too small or dingy or away from people and socialization. Let's be careful of unintended consequences that in the end still harm the dog's welfare because then we didn't ultimately accomplish the goal, we just moved the problem. |
| Roger vonDoenhoff | Federal Way | WA | Yes | | | We desperately need SOME kind of law to point to so that SOME kind of action can be taken (even if it's only an officer knocking on their door & talking to them) in the cases where a dog is CLEARLY and OBVIOUSLY being neglected and/or abused in this way. I had a situation a year ago where a dog was clearly being neglected, but there was absolutely nothing I could do, and nothing any organization could do, because there are currently no legal limits on neglect or chaining/confining of dogs. | | Even though it might not be feasible to have a black-and-white law that clearly defines "neglect" or "abuse" vs. reasonable dog-chaining or dog-fencing, I still think we need a law to point to and use in cases where it's clear there's animal cruelty. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Karleen Brigham | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | Benefits: Happy dogs. Statistically, chained dogs are forgotten and neglected. My thoughts are if you have to tie a dog in a yard you shouldn't have a dog. Present a positive approach to the public with statistics, and spell out the cons of having a chained dog. The message needs to be clear to the public. Ideas? Give a tax break for having a fence or buliding a fence to keep a dog in. Create a positive approach to the public. As part of the Ordinance a firm take on the wording regarding penalties and jail time for first offenders. Educate the public on the harm that can come from tethering. Make it mandatory indoor or fence in order to have a dog. Provide clean bedding,food,water and shelter in incumbent weather. Legislators need to inforce a penalty that is going to get the attention of offenders. Create a state registry of tethered dogs and offenders. http://www.helpinganimals.com/ga_ChainingAddressed.asp#California | | I would like to share a personal experience which empowered my thoughts on "no tethering" I moved to West Seattle 5 years ago. I was unaware of the dog that lived ajacent to our property until the cries and the whining started. The years went on the cries became louder and barking more frequently. I couldn't take it anymore so I called Animal Control. The reports indicated Rex the large black shepherd was in agonizing pain from years of neglect and forgetten life on a chain. The one and only documented time that Rex ever went to a vet is when the neighbor took him. Rex's ears were so badly infected and went untreated for so long that he lost hearing and was in terrible pain. His living conditions were barely enough to keep him from the elements and he barked and cried every single day and night... I have lived in my home for 5 years and every night for the past 5 years I HEARD HIM CRY. Personally, I am mad and sad, at myself for not doing something sooner. I am disappointed that no one else in the neighborhood sought help for Rex either.His crying tore me up inside... until on |
| Rita Laws | Monroe | WA | Yes | | | It is a safety issue. It has been proven that tethered dogs are more likely to bite, cause more noise disturbance and are more likely to be anti-social. | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Susanne Coutts | Auburn | WA | Yes | | | I've seen a dog strangle to death by having two chained dogs too close together. If the ban fails at least enact a requirement that makes them maintain a 10 ft separation. I've also seen them drag dog houses that far to mate. | | Continuous dog tethering is cruel and harms many, many animals. I removed a collar that had literally grown into a dogs neck, seen more than one choking death and atrophy of the front legs of dogs who have been continually tethered. I totally support this ban! Although I do understand that people may need to do temporary tethers, when camping, perhaps while at work while they work on a more permanent solution... there should be some allowances but not over 30 days at the most and I only advocate allowances because I'm practical and I want people to be able to enclose their dogs rather than just have to get rid of them due to the law. Make the fines STEEP. My old neighbor has 6 dogs who have lived on chains for years, I'd like to see him made to change or chained like his dogs - can we make that the punishment? No? Why not? Because it's cruel? Well, doesn't that answer the whole issue of tethering?! |
| Rhonda Blake | Gastonia | NC | Yes | | | Less dog bites , less rabies , It could also help with the pet over population | | Animals that are chained are exposed to the elements , most have never been vetted and live where they can be exposed to other animals Racoons other dogs , they become territortial and protective of there space , if a child wonders into there space they will most likely attack. |
| Linnea Bennett | Bellevue | WA | Yes | | | Education for the public. I have a neighbor that tethers her dog, but she doesn't speak English. I'm not sure that she understands that this is wrong behaviour. | | There may be circumstances that require tethering - the homeowner doesn't have a fence for instance. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Crystal Kennedy | Auburn | WA | Yes | | | I hope to see less people tethering their dogs. I have seen many tethered dogs escape and go on to chase people and other animals in the neighborhood. I am concerned that the escaped dog may cause injury to another animal or to a human being. I am also concerned for the sake of the dog. The dog could become injured or killed while it is roaming free. If the dog is tethered well, there are still problems to address. If an aggressive animal or person approaches them, they have no means for immediate escape. I also believe that tethering a dog affects it's personality negatively and leads to a more aggressive dog. | | |
| Ajoy R Raj | Kirkland | WA | Yes | | | Have started hearing of more cases around King county of dogs being left on the leash for so long. I would like to see more humane treatment of animals and King county legislation to lead the way on it. | | |
| Karen Eckert | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | The main benefit I see is happier and less agressive dogs. | | If tethering regulations are put in place, I am concerned about home owners not tethering, but also not having sufficient control of their dogs. Dogs can jump pretty high to get over fences or dig their way out. |
| Lena Schultz | Marysville | WA | Yes | | | Tethering and chaining makes dogs aggressive. If a ban was placed, then the number of dog attacks in King County would be reduced. | | I 100% am in support of a ban on tethering or chaining dogs. If a ban was enacted, may positive issues would flow downstream. I would like to see more bans on tethering/chaining across the country. Dog fighting, dog abuse, dog neglect and dog attacks would all be reduced. |
| Paulette McKay | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | The main benefit is another means to restrict cruelty to animals. In some cases, tethering is tantamount to abandonment as dogs are left for hours, or even days, subject to the weater, without shelter, food, or water, and without companionship. | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Elliot Weiner | Tacoma | WA | Yes | | | serious penalties - including removing the dog from the owner for violations. | | This is humane legislation. Tethering produces escaped, sick, and sometimes dangerous dogs. Owners who tether should not own dogs. |
| Justin Hales | Auburn | WA | Yes | | | More humane treatment of animals. | | |
| Nelly Delgado | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | The benefit is a more humane treatment of dogs and encouraging people to be responsible dog owners. People that tether their dog shouldn't be allowed to have one. | | |
| Cathy P | Duvall | WA | Yes | | | Cannot leave a dog chained up; this may reduce the number of people who have dogs and then neglect and abuse them. | | |
| Phil Joyner | Kenmore | WA | Yes | | | I would like to see people treat dogs as the social animals they are rather than as nuisances to be tied up and forgotten in back yards. Tethering dogs for long periods could increase aggressiveness and is cruel to the animals. | | |
| Dianne Walker | Poulsbo | WA | Yes | | | Fewer mistreated dogs. | | |
| Leslie Kentor | Buckley | WA | Yes | | | Dogs are social animals and have been known to literally go insane when left isolated on a chain or rope or alone in a small crate or kennel. These dogs often become very protective of their space and can be extremely dangerous when they escape or when a child or adult approaches Limiting the time a dog and be tethered and/or confined to a small space will make King County safer. Because dogs are very social animals, it is also inhumane to leave them tethered or confined with no human contact.l | | States and even countries have laws limited how how a dog can be left alone on a tether or small space. King County should lead the state of Washington by enacting this legislation |
| Melody Whitworth | Hallsville | MO | Yes | | | limitations on tethering, restrictions on tethers used, i.e. no chains. Restrictions on collars used and strict fines and removal of dog if these limitiations are not met by members of community. ACO to have more control to go on property and remove dogs that are being neglecte outside, and able to check inside house for neglected "inside" pets. | | If more and more communities set the example regarding limiting and even banning dog tethering, it would soon become an "unacceptable" practice. Thousands of dollars can also be raised by the communities who have tethering legislation if inforced. This money can be used to help with the local animal shelters and/or county animal projects. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Denise Lantz | Grafton | WV | Yes | | | It wouldnt allow people to just tie their dogs out and leave them there. | | |
| jackie cress | Mount Vernon | WA | Yes | | | I would never support chaining an animal up. | It is inhumane. There are many dangers for dogs who are chained. | |
| Sandra Schaefer | Tacoma | WA | Yes | | | I would like to see a limit on how long a dog is chained up,and restricted use during the cold weather. | I would like to see a clean dog house,fresh food and water for the dog and limited 2-4 hrs, MAX left on the chain. | I see to many people tether their dog outside and forget the dog,it is just there for security.It is cruel to have a dog live it's life limited to a chain and mud.They also create a lot of barking disturbing the neighborhood. |
| Cory McKee | Redmond | WA | Yes | | | As a resident of the state of Washington, I would like to see our state come together with others that have already enacted the same type of legislation. As a neighbor to dogs that are chained all day long, having tougher animal welfare laws would help ourselves, those dogs and surrounding neighbors live a more peaceful life. Having tougher laws would require owners of confined pets to be more responsible when it comes to their pets well being, (and neighbors). To become well-adjusted companion animals, dogs should interact regularly with people and other animals, and should receive regular exercise. It is an owner's responsibility to properly restrain her dog, just as it is the owner's responsibility to provide adequate attention and socialization. Placing an animal on a restraint to get fresh air can be acceptable if it is done for a short period. However, keeping an animal tethered for long periods should never be acceptable. A chained animal is caught in a vicious cycle; frustrated by long periods of boredom and social isolation, he becomes a neurotic shell of his former self—fur | | Continuous chaining or tethering is both inhumane and a threat to the safety of the confined dog, other animals, and humans. A dog kept chained alone in one spot for hours, days, months, or even years suffers immense psychological damage. An otherwise friendly and docile dog, when kept continuously chained, becomes neurotic, unhappy, anxious, and often aggressive. In addition to The Humane Society of the United States and numerous animal experts, the U. S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) issued a statement in the July 2, 1996, Federal Register against tethering: "Our experience in enforcing the Animal Welfare Act has led us to conclude that continuous confinement of dogs by a tether is inhumane. A tether significantly restricts a dog's movement. A tether can also become tangled around or hooked on the dog's shelter structure or other objects, further restricting the dog's movement and potentially causing injury." In 1997, the USDA ruled that people and organizations regulated by the Animal Welfare Act cannot keep dogs continuously chained The American |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Kelly Page | seattle | WA | Yes | | | Not to tether or pen a dog for longer than 3 hours a day and have this actively enforced. I work in rescue and know that people will not be honest about the amount of time a dog would be tied up. I would also like to see provisions set for the dogs who live outdoors on a chain, pen or in a yard. Such as hay and a large enough dog house for warmth, constant food and water and they Must be brought inside if the temperature drops below 40 degrees. | | Chaining dogs can lead to aggression in animals as they are not able to socialize with people or other animals. If the animals ever get loose they can be a danger to other dogs and people. Aside from the fact that it is no life for a dog to live on a chain, the harsh cold weather and inadequate shelter and care has the dogs suffering immensely from being on a chain. Please help these animals and ban chaining and penning in yards. Also ban dogs living outdoors with proper warmth and shelter. Lastly please increase the number of Animal Control officers so that this law can be enforced. Otherwise people will continue to chain their dogs and say they have only had them on the chain for less than 3 hours. |
| Jennifer McKee | Redmond | WA | Yes | | | An otherwise friendly and happy dog, when kept continually chained and isolated, often becomes neurotic, unhappy, anxious, and aggressive. Studies show that chained dogs are much more likely to bite than unchained dogs. I have a small child living next door to two chained dogs. There is not a fence between our two house and the dogs are tied up to the side of their house between the two houses. Chained dogs may unintentionally hang themselves which I have witnessed with these dogs. One of them constantly hung itself and would scream until it was freed. The female that is chained is not spayed. Any "intact" male dog roaming has access to the female. She is not behind a fence of any kind. Unwanted puppies create havoc on already overcrowded shelters. There should be some responsibility from the owner of a chained animal to keep that from happening. I would like very much for the owners to have more responsibility when it comes to the quality of life of their pet. There is no reason pets should be tied up outside all day long with little to no human interaction. Why even own a | | I currently live next door to two dogs that are tethered ALL DAY long. Rain, snow or shine. It's very hard for had and emotionally tiring to see this and observe their behavior every day. These dogs are under tremendous stress from lack of attention and exercise. They pace back and forth while growling. One of the dogs broke loose one day and ran into our yard. I do have a small child who was thankfully not outside at the time. These dogs bark constantly. Constant barking is a sign from the dog of some form of abuse and or extreme stress and they are so frustrated that they bark at everything. Cars driving by, people walking, animals, etc. When it rains they bark about getting wet. It's very hard for neighbors to have to live with this and see this go on and feel completely helpless to the situation. The only thing I've been able to do is file a complaint with KC Animal control which I have but it has not ended the animals suffering, or my families. We have also contacted local authorizes and the city or Redmond to no avail. We are in the process of m |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Marc Ryan | Kirkland | WA | Yes | | | Tethering dogs makes them dangerous and unstable. Legislation addressing constant tethering as neglect (if not abuse) would be helpful as a start. | | It's fairly common sense. When you see a dog that has been on a chain so long that he it has grown into his neck, and see the nervous tension and aggression caused by this abuse/neglect, you very quickly realize the potential harm, when a neighbor child might accidentally happen through the yard or attempt to tease the animal. |
| Kari Andersen | East Wenatchee | WA | Yes | | | | | Teathering has been shown to cause behavior problems such as agression.It also puts the animal at a much greater risk for injury.Please inact this Law to protect our animals. |
| Tonya Scanlan | Redmond | WA | Yes | | | I do agree that there needs to be limitations on how long a dog can be tethered outside. I see tethering as an option for those whose pets won't stay in the yard or they don't have a fenced yard. I believe the general time limit for this should be 8 hours, but also believe that required shelter should be provided for extreme weather - be it hot or cold. | I do not believe that setting unreasonable time limits is what is needed. I believe there are those people who have no option but to tether a pet while they are at work, which can be around 8 hours, but I don't think that setting limits such as 5 hours makes sense. If a person wishes to tether a pet 24 hours a day then they shouldn't own a dog and it should be removed from their custody. I had to tether my dog at one time when she was escaping our yard. I did this only during the time I had to be at work and she was inside the remainder of the time. | I would like to see limits set to dog tethering, but I also do not want the limits to be so stringent that it hurts those who are using it in the correct way. Dogs should not be tethered when their owners are home. Tethering should only be used when necessary (i.e., work). |
| Liza Benbow | Bellevue | WA | Yes | | | tying up dogs is cruel and and causes mean dogs. They are very social creatures that cannot tolerate being treated as outsiders of the "pack" or family. Most dogs that are tied up are doneso by people that have no business owning a odg,m wither they have no time for theirpet, or no desire to be responsible pet owners. These dogs are almost always untrained, malnurished and neglected, not to mention dying of depression and atrophy. | | these two websites say more than could ever. I hope you take the time to look them over and consider the truth and convictions in their messages. http://www.mothersagainstdogchaining.org / http://www.dogsdeservebetter.com/ |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emily Scofield | seattle | WA | Yes | | | better education of dog owners for healthy alternatives to tethering their pet. | | I am supportive of the restriction, however, I am concerned that many animals will suffer because dogs may be put in less than comfortable situations as an alternative to tethering. It is important that dogs are aloud outdoor time and space to play and explore. The addition of more fenced dog parks would help this problem. Also, dogs who are aggressive and protective of their yards or homes are seeing passers-by as a threat and these dogs' owners need education in correcting aggressive behavior with positive reinforcement training techniques. Free classes on these techniques should be offered for the safety and health of all humans and canines involved. |
| Teresa McMurrin | Bremerton | WA | Yes | | | I believe that no dog should live all or even most of it's life tethered. Dogs are social animals and it breeds unsocialization, thus problems with the dogs. It is also more common for tethered dogs to be neglected in proper nutrition, shelter and health care; all basic needs and requirements. Lastly, it's a cruel way to force them to live. | | I think that there should be fines handed down and enforced. One fine, one time. Second time, take the dog and ban from future ownership. |
| Alana Koponen | Puyallup | WA | Yes | | | The benefits would include reducing the risk of animal abuse and supporting a more humane environment for pets. Dog tethering should be completely banned. | | My only concern about this Ordinance is that the King County Council will not follow through with strictly enforcing the dog tethering restrictions. My hope is that this Ban will be approved and the Council will make sure that it is thoroughly enforced. |
| Nancy Williams | Spanaway | WA | Yes | | | Specifics on alternative for containment. | | When will Pierce County do the same? |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Stacya Silverman | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | Reducing animal cruelty, reducing the effect of teaching children that it is ok to get a dog but never walk it and just leave it tied up all day long. This is really an awful practice. | | Why would anyone get a dog and keep it tied up for the dog's life? It is almost something a sociopath might do, with no compassion. Why have a dog? As a state, we can hold our heads up by passing laws that protect animals from ignorant people, people who teach children that this is how you treat a dog. That you do not need to walk it, ever. Just get one and tie it up in the back yard. Education is the key, and state animal welfare law enforcement can teach people what it means to have a dog as a pet. |
| Sanford Feibus | Sequim | WA | Yes | | | Strictker laws for animal cruelty | | |
| Ajay Desai | BELLEVUE | WA | Yes | | | We need Enforcement of dog tethering. | | |
| tracy | enumclaw | WA | Yes | | | makes dogs less aggressive,no tethering period. Dogs should be in a covered kennel with dog house, appropriate for their size. | | If enacted it must be enforced. Please make the penalty stiff. possible minimum fine at least $300.00 for fine after 1st warning. |
| Jerry Daddio | Redmond | WA | Yes | | | | Tethering is not acceptable for any dogs which are not in the immediate sight and care of their owners. These dogs can become victims of a any number of mishaps as well as people or other animals that might come in cantact with them. It is not humane and should not be legal. | Recall that old PSA television spot. Folks sitting in their living room watching TV and wondering where that puppy went that they got the child for last Christimas. And it alone chained up in their back yard. It was wrong then and it is just as wrong now. |
| Charla Buerkle | Kenmore | WA | Yes | | | Dogs continually tethered are deprived of the socialization necessary to become family pets. It is cruel punishment to take a dog and tie it up and expect it to have a happy life. | I believe all dogs that are taken in as a "pet" should be have access to the indoors. I have a dog and two cats and all live in my home and are well adjusted to people as they are part of my family and act as such. I believe the ordinance should require pet owners to provide any pets to indoor access, outdoor exercise, and human comfort and care. Otherwise don't get a pet. | Dogs living a life as a pet should be included in the family and treated as a part of the "pack". Excluding a dog from the family by tying it outside alone is comparable to isolating a small child from its family. A well adjusted dog is one that is safe with family members as well as strangers. The only way to insure this is to treat a pet as a part of the family. Including it - not isolating it. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Rani | Burien | WA | Yes | | | It would be beneficial because chaining dogs can bring out aggressive tendencies in any breed, especially if they are chained in small areas. Chaining a dog for too long should be seen as neglect, which again promotes aggression. It would seem fair that dogs left alone should not be chained especially because of the possibility of them breaking free. | | People neglect their dogs and do not take responsibilty of owning a potenially dangerous animal. Because people think they can just leave their dogs on a chain or in the backyard contributes to this neglect, which in turn can make an animal aggressive. Territiorial aggression, food aggression and unsocialization aggression are all consequences of neglect. Owners should also not be allowed to leave their dog in the backyard for extended periods of time (such as longer than 7 hours) because of the same neglect issues. |
| Beverly Sorci | Sumner | WA | Yes | | | I feel if someone owns a dog they should have a fenced yard, where the dog has room to get the exercise they need. I don't think it is right to pen up dogs or tether them. I don't believe people should have pets if they can't provide for them properly by either having a secure yard for them with shelter from the elements or making them indoor pets. | | We had a black labrador named King, when I was growing up that hung himself because he was tethered. He had been tethered for a long time, then one day something went wrong. He was my brother's dog and when Randy went out to get him after school for play time he found him dead. My brother is 60 and hasn't ever gotten over the guilt from that ordeal. In fact, he never even allowed himself the enjoyment of having a dog until a stray showed up on his doorstep a few years ago. I'm telling you this so I can show you the emotional scares that can be left behind when a dog dies from being tethered/chained. |
| Jennifer Davis | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | Dogs who are tied out on a chain often become dangerous, while dogs who are well socialized and supervised rarely bite. Many dogs are hurt while chained; often if left on the chain it will grow in to the neck- happens often. Chaining a dog is a form of animal abuse- and this shoudl be a recognized fact. | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Joshua Semerjian | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | Many dogs in my neighborhood suffer from neglect, and part of that includes being left tied up outdoors. As a result of this, the dogs "cry" for attention and/or help. The problem: they bark a lot, and bark repeatedly when my dog and I walk by. It is a noise and canine health issue. The benefit to the ban would be dignity for dogs, of course. | | It is a noise, safety and dignity issue. If dogs didn't have to bark so much for attention, they would be much better at providing protection against neighborhood criminals. |
| Jennifer Jenkins | Centralia | WA | Yes | | | I do not think that it is fair to animals to be chained or locked up. They have the right to have space to let out the energy they have. They would not get as aggressive if they are loved like they should be. | | |
| Michael Moore | Renton | WA | Yes | | | The benefits are primarily for the animals themselves. Tethering is a hideous practice that induces pain, restricts movement, and keeps an animal from experiencing any life whatsoever. It is tragic to see dogs chained with a limited chain unable to be social (their nature) or to interact with their surroundings. An animal exists to provide companionship (some to provide a sense of safety and security, as well) and dogs who are tethered are not considered a companion, nor a pet. If someone cannot, or will not, care for the animal, there are plenty of places to give them up. | | IF you need volunteer help to document cases, I would be willing to be one of those people. |
| Jennifer Dorris | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | I would like to reduce animal cruelty and make dog owners more responsible for their actions. | | |
| Julia N Allen, PhD, DVM | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | Tethering promotes aggressive behaviors such as lunging and barking at the end of the line, prey chasing. It also promotes pacing and other repetitive behaviors that result from boredom. Tethered dogs are often not socialized with people or other animals, which can create a risk to the community should they get loose. Tethering is not humane. | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Dan Mullins | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | Tethering a any dog for long periods should be considered animal abuse and should result in a persons right to own a pet being revoked. | | It's very simple. Unaccompanied dogs thethered for long periods simple cruel. It should be against the law and punishable. |
| Marina Megale | Normandy Park | WA | Yes | | | I recommend that King County enact legislation limiting chaining of dogs outdoors to no longer than a 3 hour period per day and only if the animal is provided with free access to food and water and access to a covered, raised waterproof shelter at all times. Furthermore, if the temperature is any hotter than 85 or colder than 45, I believe that outdoor chaining should not be allowed. I also would recommend that limited chaining only be allowed during daylight hours between 8am-4pm. These limitations would encourage dog owners to not simply chain it up and forget it, or to leave the dog chained for hour after hour, all day. The dogs wouldn't get so bored and would be less likely to bark incessantly, disturbing the neighbors. I think it is critical that the regulations re food, water and shelter and temperature limitations be strictly enforced to protect the lives of the dogs that are are left outdoors, chained. I think that dog owners who do not obey the regulations should recieve 1 warning in writing and then should recieve monetary fines, starting at 50$ p | | |
| Cheryl Bell | Renton | WA | Yes | | | People should be held liable for the suffering of pets that are just put on a chain in the backyard and then just left there. I feel that people should be held accountable for their actions. Pets need to be exercised and socialized. Long tethering is a form of neglect. | | The first time an officer is called out to a house for a complaint about a dog being tether for a long period of time there should be a warning and then a followup. On the second complaint a fine should be given. Third complaint court appearance. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mike Dady | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | Less abuse of animals due to ignorance or willful neglect. | | My experience of having to watch and listen from our living room window a tethered dog yelping, barking and crying due to its immobility and discomfort is a primary reason for my support. The chain on this particular dog was no more than 10 feet in length and the dog was approximately 80 lbs. Owners paid no attention to the dog whatsoever and had they not had the ability to legally tether the dog they would have had to part with the animal as they could not have afforded nor been allowed by their landlord to install a fence or pen. The poor dog wound up being rescued by an animal rescue group due to KC Animal Control not being able to do anything due to the lenient law. |
| Bonita Davis | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | | | |
| Rose Bigham | Kirkland | WA | Yes | | | The benefits of legislation restricting dog tethering are that it would likely reduce the number of dog agression/biting incidents for those dogs left unsupervised; it would provide legal recourse for those owners who neglect dogs who are left tethered for excessive time. I would like to see a time limit for tethering; requirements for food, water, and shade; requirements for sufficient supervision of dogs tethered. | Not opposed at all. Owning a dog is a privilege, not a right. If you choose to own a dog than you should be legally required to provide adequate supervision for that animal. That means a sufficently fenced yard, or an animal on leash being actively supervised. Tying up a dog and leaving them is unconscionable. | I think it is high time that legislation such as this is passed. It is just not safe to the dog - due to exposure to potential predators they may encounter with no ability to flee, and limited ability to fight - or to other dogs or children who might accidentally wander in to the tethered dog's "zone". If a dog is tied and feels threatened then they must fight or flee; if they can't flee then bad things are almost predictably likely to happen. Please enact appropriate legislation forthwith! |
| Kelly R | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | being a volunteer for a rescue group, I think this would be a huge help in how dogs are treated. Dogs that can be tied up outside have huge emotional damage done that is very hard to reverse. | | |
| todd petersen | seattle | WA | Yes | | | Reduction in noise (barking), chained dogs are crazy. | | |
| Stacy Price | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | | | Dogs are pack animals and should not be banished to a lonely life alone in the elements. Tethering has been shown to promote aggression. |
| Bill Sanders | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | The benefit is more humane treatment of dogs | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Margo Murphy | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | I'm sick and tired of people treating dogs like crap and want something done to take these people to task. | | |
| Patrick Allen | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | Time limits on how long and under what weather conditions a dog can be teathered, that they should have access to water as well. | | |
| Kris Kirwan | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | Humae treatment of animals. Responsibilities of pet ownership include licensing, feeding and healthcare. Continuous tethering is not humane or healthy and only breeds viscious, angry, territorial animals. | | Let's move forward as a civilization and care for those who cannot speak for themselves. |
| Brandie Ahlgren | Seattle | WA | Yes | | | More humane treatment of animals. | | |
| Tony Flora | giving out this info | WA | | No | | | Dog tethering in and of itself does not constitute cruelty. Only on an individual basis where the dog's safety and well being has been compromised should there be cause for further action. Some dogs are well suited to being outdoors constantly in all kinds of inclemant weather. I used to live in Alaska, where almost all sled dogs are tethered. I'm talking thousands of dogs. I saw little cause for alarm. And where are you going to stop. Is it cruel to keep a horse in cross-ties in the barn or a 12 X 12 stall. There are enough laws to deal with animal cruelty as it is. Enforce them. | |
| carol zielke | seattle | WA | | No | | | | |
| Bonnie Knight | San Francisco | CA | | No | | Although I do not reside in your county, my heart goes out to the dogs of your County. Tethering is just plain cruel and unnecessary. The benefits of the Ordinance are clearly to relieve the suffering of tethered dogs. Owners who would treat their dogs this way need to be educated about the welfare needs of their dogs. | | |
| Eleanor Dowson | Mill Creek | WA | | No | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sanford Staab | Woodinville | WA | | No | | | I do not see what gives the county jurisdiction over any pet or animal owned by an individual. Animals do not have "rights" in the sense that they are not made in the image of God. Where does this stop? Will cutting trees down become a criminal act? (I guess under some circumstances it already is) Certainly cruelty is not good and I think anyone witnessing in public such should have the ability to prosecute based on being offended but the county has no business making laws about this. | |
| Chris Hydro | Wheaton | MD | | No | | No benefit | please see http://www.dogsdeservebetter.com/home.html Dogs that are tethered, in any fashion, cause many more issues than those that are inside, integrated into a family. | There is no need for this type of restraint in this day and age. There are so many better solutions. |
| John Unbehend | Burien | WA | | No | | | I am very concerned about the potential abuse of an ordinance of this type against dog owners that resposibly / humanely tether or confine their pets for reasonable periods. Yes, there are instances of abuse where owners have kept pet tethered or confined in an inhuman manner. It will be all but impossible to define what unreasonable tethering is or what constitues small areas of confinement. The existing animal control laws that are in place to prevent abuse should be used (or beefed up) to save animals that are in circumstances where abuse is taking place. | I have real concern that there appears to be involvement of the United States Humane Society. This group has nothing to do with the saving of abused animals or direct support of shelters / services that do (please see: http://www.activistcash.com/organization_overview.cfm/oid/136 ). This group has a track record of trying to get local and state governments to establish laws that sound logical and, on the surface, help protect animals in trouble. My concern it that HSUS and other more radical animal rights groups (PETA for example) will then seek to use these laws to abridge the rights of any and all legitimate dog owners. Pleas keep in mind that the vast majority of pet owners are very responsible. Please be wary of organizations that attempt to improperly use governmental action to push their own agendas. Thanks. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Jan Greye | Renton | WA | | No | | | Tethering a dog is not natural. I am a dog-sitter and wrote a book on dogs. Instead the dog should have training and be allowed freedom. Dog runs are more humane than tethering. It does not allow them to relieve themselves and leave the area. | As a final word,tethering does not solve the problem if a person/family cannot afford proper saftey for the dog, they should not be allowed to adopt one. A fine should be imposed. This again is not humane. |
| Julia Leonas | Seattle | WA | | No | | Dog tethering creates mean dogs. Period. Mean dogs bite people. Dogs that bite are "put down." We are creating our own public problem. The laws that stand are inhumane and we are to blame. | | The laws that stand are inhumane. I have witnessed pointless suffering and it needs to stop. Many people profit from the cruelty inflicted on man's best friend. |
| D.H | Covington | WA | | No | | | Some dogs naturally will do ANYTHING to escape a fence or containment area. It is amazing what they can accomplish when they are determined to be free. Without tethering these animals, there is a great potential for them to escape causing property damage, harm to themselves and potentially humans(if they are scared & bite). This would potentially add more strain to our already overpopulated animal shelters if these dogs escaped and had to be picked up by the AC agent. As long as there is food/shelter/safe & sanitary conditions, there should not be any other imposition by the county. | I believe this would harm the people that that are trying to be responsible pet owners and insure the safety of their pets. If you have a dog that digs,breaks thru fences,jumps, and radio fences don't faze the animal, there is no other option to keep the animal safe from its self! |
| Karen Johnson | Seattle | WA | | No | | | Tethering an animal is cruel and creates aggressiveness in animals. I'm not sure which is worse (tethering or caging), it still cruel. They are normally teased by children who are not accompanied by an adult. | If anyone is to tether their animal, they should not be allowed to have an animal. |
| laura preftes | seattle | WA | | No | | Dog tethering is cruel, neglectful, causes undue stress to the dog and creates a nuisance in the neighborhood because of the dog's crying and barking. Please ban dog tethering. Thank you. | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sherri Gage | Spokane | WA | | No | | | Dog simply should not be tethered. Ever. End of story. If it is necessary to tie up a dog, then the individual involved should not have one. You either provide a safe, contained area (fenced yard), or you pass on having a dog. | This is cruel, and cruelty should not be permitted or allowed. We need to start approaching animal issues with compassion and intelligence. Would you want to be tied up to a tree, or even have a tether attaching you to one of those long wires between two trees? If the answer is no, then it should not be encouraged for dogs either. |
| Ann Campbell | Edmonds | WA | | No | | I would like to see dog tethering either banned or a time limit requirement made. The abuse from long time chaining of a dog is inhumane. | | |
| Jennymarie Moran | Redmond | WA | | No | | I would like to see a reduction in animal abuse cases in Redmond. Perhaps we should enact a fenced-in policy for dogs as well? | | Dog chaining/tethering allows for miss-treatment. Dogs require attention, companionship, and excercise. Chaining is a simple way for people to forget about their animals and put in place with lack of training. |
| Keith Hawley | Seattle | WA | | No | | | They are animals that are the property of owners. Don't waste county money on this issue. | |
| jean szeles | seattle | WA | | No | | | dogs should be walked regularly or safely enclosed in a yard...they need exercise they should NOT be attached to a pole on a leash | |
| Greg Magone | Auburn | WA | | No | | | I do not believe it is the purpose of the county to regulate how we interact with our animals. Can the county also require that we allow them to live in our houses? Can they regulate the number of times a day we walk them? Please, allow us to keep our pets in a manner suitable to us. | Some people own outdoor dogs and do not have a fence. The county currently requires the animals to be confined to the property. How would they confine the animals if they cannot afford a fence and the animal is unsuitable for indoors? |
| Lynell Aber | Seatac | WA | | No | | | I think it wiil make the dogs les able to behave when they are free, thats all they will want to do is be free | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Doug Schey | Everett | WA | | | I need more information | Dog tethering has its place as a part time use specially if the tether is a dog run tether system that is safe and free of potential tangling. | Concerns over yet more regulation telling people how to live. We already have laws concerning animal cruelty and abuse...isnt that enough on a case by case bases? | Maybe a recomended/approved tethering system information could be made available for security type dogs with guidelines concerning how long a dog should be kept on tether...once again this is an age old tradition that now seems to be an issue with some people...need more info on topic |
| Brenda Furry | Marysville | WA | | | I need more information | Continuous tethering is abusive and can result in a dangerous dog. Often, these dogs are neglected in other ways, like shelter, food and attention. I would like to see continuous tethering as a secondary offense if lack of food or shelter also are apparent. | It can be difficult to maintain a fence system that reliably contains some dogs. During times that a dog cannot be watched, like during a gathering where the dog needs to remain outside (say post-funeral gatherings, birthday parties, etc.,.) it can provide added security to tether a dog. Some families cannot afford a fence and use a tether system as an affordable alternative. I would hate to see the ordinance make pet ownership out of reach for the less affluent. Temporary, responsible tethering should not be punished. | Tethering should be a secondary offense to other types of abuse or neglect. Unsafe tethering where the animal is unsupervised and could potentially strangle itself should result in owner education for the first offense. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Barb Baumann | Medical Lake | WA | | | | Chaining or tethering, the practice is both inhumane and a threat to the safety of the confined dog, other animals and humans. A dog kept chained in one spot for hours, days, months or even years suffers immense psychological damage. An otherwise friendly and docile dog, when kept continuously chained, becomes neurotic, unhappy, anxious and often aggressive. In many cases, the necks of chained dogs become raw and covered with sores, the result of improperly fitted collars and the dogs' constant yanking and straining to escape confinement. Dogs have even been found with collars embedded in their necks, the result of years of neglect at the end of a chain. Dogs tethered for long periods can become highly aggressive. Dogs feel naturally protective of their territory; when confronted with a perceived threat, they respond according to their fight-or-flight instinct. A chained dog, unable to take flight, often feels forced to fight, attacking any unfamiliar animal or person who unwittingly wanders into his or her territory. In addition to the psychological damage wrought by contin | | Contact the HSUS, ASPCA, PETA or any other animal welfare organization for the reasons why limits should be placed on this practice. the U. S. Department of Agriculture issued a statement in the July 2, 1996, Federal Register against tethering: "Our experience in enforcing the Animal Welfare Act has led us to conclude that continuous confinement of dogs by a tether is inhumane. A tether significantly restricts a dog's movement. A tether can also become tangled around or hooked on the dog's shelter structure or other objects, further restricting the dog's movement and potentially causing injury." Animal control and humane agencies receive countless calls every day from citizens concerned about animals in these cruel situations. Animal control officers, paid at taxpayer expense, spend many hours trying to educate pet owners about the dangers and cruelty involved in this practice. A chained animal is caught in a vicious cycle; frustrated by long periods of boredom and social isolation, he becomes a neurotic shell of his former self—further deterring human interaction and kin |
| Sharon V. Scherer | Seattle | WA | | | I need more information | The ordinance should prohibit unattended continuous tethering. If a responsible person over the age of 16 is present, then "tethering" should be permitted. A responsible person would intervene to protect the dog from self-injury and danger from people, animals, and weather. | n/a | n/a |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Dan Storie | Spokane Valley | WA | | | I need more information | Make sure no adoptable dogs are killed as a result of the ordinance. Help people with fences where needed. Maybe provide some volunteer trainers to help with other problems that may erupt from dogs that have been chained, such as aggression, digging, etc. | Money is very tight, punative fines should be a last resort. You will encourage owners to be better to their animals if you treat them as you would want to take care of the dogs (i.e., offer help, not just try to force them to "comply". I am concerned that dogs might be taken and killed rather than the owners educated and worked with. | If dogs are just let off chains/tethers they might have other behavioral issues to deal with. If they are seized they might simply be replaced with other, unaltered dogs and the problem may just continue. |
| Sean Michael Simonsen | Renton | WA | | | I need more information | | It is possible to tether a dog in a manner that is safe, providing adequate food, water, and shelter, and removing strangling hazards. Though a dog spending his life tethered to a tree is tragic, it should not make it illegal for people to do so for several hours at a time in satisfactory conditions. I agree that tethering often is a problem, but it is also often not a problem to the dog at all. | |
| Michael Jarrett | Kirkland | WA | | | I need more information | Key is the ability to accurately identify and prosecute tethering cases that are abusive and against the welfare of the animal or surrounding people. | Often it is necessary or prudent to tether a dog - many breeds of dog are perfectly capable of jumping over or digging under a 6ft fence, and it would be unreasonable to expect such dogs to remain indoors indefinitely. The ability to stake a dog in one's own private yard should NOT be banned unless linked with additional abusive behaviors, such as: - Lack of shelter. - Lack of water. - Extended periods of tethering (> 24 hours?) - Tethering in areas where dog is exposed to public. - Overweight or dangerous tethers. | Does this legislation provide any additional benefit over existing animal cruelty laws? |
| Victoria House | Seattle | WA | | | I need more information | Big punishments for violators who have dogs that bite, including taking the dog from them. | Some dogs must be confined for their own safety - dogs that chew may swallow harmful things. Dogs may escape fences. People may not be able to afford fencing their entire yard. What is a small space? | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Shawn Risley | Seattle | WA | | | I need more information | Dog access to shelter, food, water, long enough tether to get needed exercise. | If tethering is banned, some animals may be put down as they could be a danger if loose in the yard or able to escape their yard. | |

TO Ron Sims Executive of King County Council,

I am writing to encourage the King County Council to vote "yes" on the continuous chaining of dogs BAN.

I am against the chaining of dogs because I and my own dog are being currently abused by it. My neighbors tied (a once friendly dog) on a wire that runs up & down the length of my fence & their dog can reach my fence. Their dog is now aggressive and vicious!

Dogs are territorial and when tied on a fence line will fight with other dogs. Their dog also shows it's teeth at any strange person. Their dog is tied 24 hours a day, 365 days a year.

I have tried to reason with my neighbors, but they say they can do whatever they want — and will never move the dog!

Their dog did get loose once last summer and attacked a puppy — I'm suprised it wasn't

a human!

Where I live we all have large yards. Their dog is tied closer to my house than theirs — so guess who has to put up with all the barking — ME!

In winter when the temperatures are 20° the barking is even worse — I think the dog is freezing!

I've tried calling 911. they tell me that it's not a police problem & to call animal control.

Animal control was sympathic, but said legally their hands were tied. They said they could not force my neighbors to move their dog away from my fence. Animal Control told me to sue them!

Please ban the continuous chaining of dogs. It is abusive both to dogs and to next door neighbors.

Sincerely,
Barbara Speake

Phone - 360-886-2081
22020 SE 296th St.
Black Diamond, Wa. 98010

# Appendix H (sample public awareness plan/budget)

## Public Awareness Plan/Budget for Dog Tethering Restrictions

**Total Budget: $55,000**

**Plan Elements**
The 2009 Dog Tethering Restrictions awareness plan will include direct mailings and purchases in four mediums: Radio, television, print (newspaper), and outdoor (bus advertising). See below for the breakdown in spending.

**Radio**
100 ads throughout the year (2 ads per week average) on various radio stations in the market.
**$10,000 Budget**

**Television**
Ad rates on television vary widely, depending on viewers (which means the show and the time), ad availability, and demand for a particular spot. Ad rates for local television can be had for about $5 to $10 per thousand viewers for a 30 second ad. So, a 30 second ad on a show that has 10,000 viewers (daytime or nighttime tv) can be had for $100 or less. Based on this purchasing structure, a television advertising budget of $10,000 would keep ads on the air of local station several times per week select times of the year – emphasis on summer.
**$10,000 Budget**

**Print**
Seattle Times – one 15 inch ad once a month (12 ads) in either the south zone (south King County) or east zone (east King County), primarily the south zone (26-week contract rates):
**$10,000 Budget**

**Outdoor**
One Bus Back (full size) and One Bus Side (Queen size) six months of the year:
**$7,000 Budget**

**Direct Mailing**
Direct mail advertising is an excellent way to reach specific target audiences. The total cost per mailer is approximately 25 cents (including production, printing, mailing, sorting). The Animal Care and Control service area includes approximately 500,000 households. The direct mailing plan for 2009 contemplates targeted mailing to the areas with the most dog tethering.
**$10,000 Budget**

**Remnant Ads**
In addition to pre-ordered purchases, the plan also will include **$3,000** for remnant ads in print, and on radio and television. Purchasing remnant ads is sort of like purchasing a stand-by ticket for an airplane – when a radio or tv station or a newspaper have unsold ad space, they will sell it at very reduced rates rather than letting the space go unsold. Organizations that have pre-ordered ads have the best chance of purchasing remnant ads.

**$3,000 Budget**

**<u>Advertisement production</u>**
**$5,000 Budget** (assumes in-house assistance)